

Tilburg University

A globally and universally stable price adjustment process

Herings, P.J.J.

Publication date:
1994

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Herings, P. J. J. (1994). *A globally and universally stable price adjustment process*. (CentER Discussion Paper; Vol. 1994-52). Unknown Publisher.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

CBM
R

8414
1994
NR.52

ter
for
ic Research

Discussion paper



* C I N O 1 5 5 6 *



Center
for
Economic Research

5214 44
No. 9452

**A GLOBALLY AND UNIVERSALLY STABLE
PRICE ADJUSTMENT PROCESS**

by P. Jean-Jacques Herings

June 1994

ISSN 0924-7815

A Globally and Universally Stable Price Adjustment Process ‡ §

P. Jean-Jacques Herings *

Correspondence to
P.J.J. Herings
Department of Econometrics
and CentER
Tilburg University
P.O. Box 90153
5000 LE Tilburg
The Netherlands

[‡]The author would like to thank Antoon van den Elzen, Jan van Geldrop and Dolf Talman for their valuable comments on previous drafts of this paper.

[§]This research is part of the VF-program "Competition and Cooperation".

*The author is financially supported by the Cooperation Centre Tilburg and Eindhoven Universities, The Netherlands



K.U.B.
BIBLIOTHEEK
TILBURG

Abstract

A price adjustment process for an exchange economy is given that converges generically to a Walrasian equilibrium. The assumptions made with respect to consumptions sets, preferences and initial endowments are standard. No restrictions are made with respect to the starting price system. The well-known fact that the number of Walrasian equilibria is generically odd follows as a special case of the main theorem. In case of gross substitutability of demand functions convergence always takes place even without making differentiability assumptions. In this special case prices of commodities in excess demand (supply) are strictly increasing (decreasing), and therefore the qualitative behaviour of the process resembles the Walrasian tatonnement process. Moreover, on every market the absolute value of the total excess demand is monotonically decreasing.

1 Introduction

Since Walras (1874) economists have been interested in the problem of finding an adjustment process that generates, for a given economy and an arbitrarily specified starting price system, a path of price systems converging to a price system at which the total excess demand is equal to zero. The classical Walrasian tatonnement process may fail to converge if some rather restrictive assumptions on the economy are not satisfied. Examples of economies where this process does not converge are given in Scarf (1960). It is not difficult to construct other examples since by the work of Sonnenschein (1973), Mantel (1974), and Debreu (1974), every continuous function satisfying Walras' law and defined for elements of the unit simplex with all components greater than or equal to some arbitrarily small positive number is the total excess demand function of some pure exchange economy. Therefore it is interesting to look for adjustment processes that converge for every total excess demand function, i.e., convergence should hold universally, a requirement not met by the Walrasian tatonnement process.

A universally convergent process to find a fixed point of a function has been presented in Kellog, Li, and Yorke (1976), and a universally convergent process to find a zero point of a total excess demand function is given in Smale (1976). In Varian (1977) it is shown that the boundary conditions on the total excess demand function used by Smale can be relaxed if the adjustment process is extended in a particular way outside the original domain. These processes converge for a generic economy to a Walrasian equilibrium price system for almost every starting price system belonging to the boundary of the domain. However, it seems likely that an actual adjustment process may start with an arbitrarily chosen price system in the interior of the domain. In Keenan (1981) it is shown that Smale's process is not globally convergent, there may exist an open set of starting price systems for which the process does not converge to some equilibrium.

A globally and universally convergent process is presented in Kamiya (1990). Under rather weak conditions on the total excess demand function, among which the boundary condition that the excess demand of a commodity is positive if its price is zero, so that the excess demand function is also assumed to be defined on the boundary of the unit simplex, convergence is guaranteed for almost every starting price system in the interior of the unit simplex. It might be possible to weaken this boundary condition in a similar way as Varian (1977) did for Smale's process. However, from an economic point of view such a solution is not completely satisfactory since outside the original domain the adjustment process is artificially defined and, for example, does not depend on the excess demand at the price system reached, but instead on the excess demand at another price system.

In this paper an alternative globally and universally convergent price adjustment process is considered, proposed in van der Laan and Talman (1987), which has a nice economic

interpretation. In this paper it is shown that for every starting price system in the domain the process converges generically to a Walrasian equilibrium price system under standard conditions on utility functions, consumption sets, and initial endowments. Under these conditions the total excess demand function is only well defined on the interior of the unit simplex. It is not excluded that the excess demand of a commodity is not defined or becomes negative if its price goes to zero.

In Section 2 the price adjustment process is described and a definition of convergence of the process is given for which continuity, instead of differentiability, of the total excess demand function is sufficient. Defining the process also for continuous total excess demand functions will be very useful in Section 4 where the special case of total excess demand functions satisfying gross substitutability in the finite increment form is considered, the same case as the one for which Arrow, Block, and Hurwicz (1959) showed convergence of the Walrasian tatonnement process as formulated by Samuelson (1941). In this case it is sufficient to assume continuity of the total excess demand function in order to give a proof of convergence of the process considered in this paper.

The process is illustrated using the first example of Scarf (1960). For the economy given in this example the price adjustment process converges for every starting price system in the unit simplex. In Section 2 the main result which holds for an arbitrary exchange economy satisfying standard assumptions is presented. Corollaries of this result are the generic convergence of the price adjustment process, and the well-known result (see Dierker (1972)) that generically the number of Walrasian equilibria is odd. In Section 3 the proof of the main result is given. In Section 4 the adjustment process is analyzed for the special case where a continuous total excess demand function satisfies the gross substitutability condition. In this special case convergence does not only hold generically as the results of Smale (1976) and Kamiya (1990) but, instead, occurs always. In this case it can be shown that prices of commodities in excess demand (supply) are strictly increasing (decreasing) during the adjustment process. Therefore the process has some features which are qualitatively the same as for the Walrasian tatonnement process. In the gross substitutability case it is also shown that if a market reaches an equilibrium situation during the process, then it stays in equilibrium for the rest of the process. An even stronger result will be proved, on every market the absolute value of the total excess demand is monotonically decreasing.

2 The Price Adjustment Process

In the following, for $k \in \mathbf{N}$, I_k denotes the set of integers $\{1, \dots, k\}$, \mathbf{R}_+^k denotes the non-negative orthant of the k -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbf{R}^k , and \mathbf{R}_{++}^k denotes the set

$\{x \in \mathbf{R}^k \mid \forall j \in I_k, x_j > 0\}$. Moreover, 0^k (1^k) denotes a k -dimensional vector of zeros (ones), and $0^{k \times l}$ ($1^{k \times l}$) denotes a $k \times l$ matrix of zeros (ones), for $k, l \in \mathbf{N}$. In this section the price adjustment process is described for an exchange economy $\mathcal{E} = (\{X^i, u^i, \omega^i\}_{i=1}^m)$ and a given starting price system v . There are m consumers indexed $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $n + 1$ commodities indexed $j = 1, \dots, n + 1$. Each consumer is defined by a consumption set X^i , a utility function $u^i : X^i \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, and a vector of initial endowments ω^i . The vector $(\omega^1, \dots, \omega^m)^\top$ will be denoted by ω . The excess demand correspondence of this economy is given by a (possibly empty-valued) correspondence $z : \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$, which associates with every price system $p \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ the set $z(p)$ of total excess demands compatible with the selection by every consumer of an optimal consumption bundle in his budget set. A vector p^* is a Walrasian equilibrium price system if $0^{n+1} \in z(p^*)$. Sufficient conditions on consumption sets, initial endowments, and preferences can be given such that if $p^* \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ is a Walrasian equilibrium price system then $p^* \in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1}$. Moreover, z is a function which is continuous, homogeneous of degree zero on \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} , and satisfies Walras' law, $p \cdot z(p) = 0$, $\forall p \in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1}$, see for example Hildenbrand and Kirman (1988). Let S^n denote the relative interior of the n -dimensional unit simplex, so $S^n = \{p \in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} \mid \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} p_j = 1\}$. Let \bar{S}^n denote the closure of S^n . By the homogeneity of degree zero there is no loss of generality in normalizing the price systems such that they belong to S^n .

From now on let z be a continuous function defined on S^n satisfying Walras' law. Moreover, let the starting price system v be an arbitrary element of S^n . The vector $s \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ is called a feasible sign vector if for every $j \in I_{n+1}$, $s_j \in \{-1, 0, +1\}$, for some $k \in I_{n+1}$, $s_k = -1$, while for another $k \in I_{n+1}$, $s_k = +1$. Let \mathcal{S} denote the set of feasible sign vectors in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} . Given a sign vector $s \in \mathcal{S}$ define the sets $I^-(s) = \{j \in I_{n+1} \mid s_j = -1\}$, $I^0(s) = \{j \in I_{n+1} \mid s_j = 0\}$, and $I^+(s) = \{j \in I_{n+1} \mid s_j = +1\}$. Moreover, let $k^-(s)$, $k^0(s)$, and $k^+(s)$ denote the number of elements in the sets $I^-(s)$, $I^0(s)$, and $I^+(s)$, respectively. Notice that for a feasible sign vector s it holds that $k^0(s) \leq n - 1$. In order to describe the adjustment process, for every sign vector $s \in \mathcal{S}$ the sets $A(s)$, $B(s)$, and $C(s)$ of price systems are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} A(s) &= \{p \in S^n \mid \forall k \in I_{n+1}, \frac{p_k}{v_k} = \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j}{v_j} \text{ if } s_k = -1, \text{ and } \frac{p_k}{v_k} = \max_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j}{v_j} \text{ if } s_k = +1\}, \\ B(s) &= \{p \in S^n \mid \forall j \in I_{n+1}, z_j(p) \leq 0 \text{ if } s_j = -1, z_j(p) = 0 \text{ if } s_j = 0, \text{ and } z_j(p) \geq 0 \text{ if } s_j = +1\}, \\ C(s) &= A(s) \cap B(s). \end{aligned}$$

Hence when $p \in C(s)$ then $s_j = -1$ ($s_j = +1$) implies there is excess supply (demand) on market j and the price of commodity j is relatively, i.e., with respect to the starting price v_j , minimal (maximal), and $s_j = 0$ implies that market j is in equilibrium. So the sign vector $s \in \mathcal{S}$ characterizes the state of every market. The set $\cup_{s \in \mathcal{S}} C(s)$ will be denoted by C . Clearly there is a sign vector $\bar{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ such that for every $j \in I_{n+1}$, $z_j(v) > 0$ implies $\bar{s}_j = +1$ and $z_j(v) < 0$ implies $\bar{s}_j = -1$, where Walras' law guarantees that indeed \bar{s} can be

chosen in \mathcal{S} . Then it holds that $v \in B(\bar{s})$, obviously $v \in A(\bar{s})$, hence $v \in C(\bar{s})$ and therefore $v \in C$. Consider a Walrasian equilibrium price system $p^* \in S^n$. Clearly there is a sign vector $\bar{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ such that for every $k \in I_{n+1}$, $\bar{s}_k = -1$ implies $\frac{p_k^*}{v_k} = \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j^*}{v_j}$ and $\bar{s}_k = +1$ implies $\frac{p_k^*}{v_k} = \max_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j^*}{v_j}$. Then $p^* \in A(\bar{s})$, clearly $p^* \in B(\bar{s})$, and therefore $p^* \in C(\bar{s}) \subset C$. Hence, the set C contains both the starting price system v and all Walrasian equilibrium price systems.

A subset of a topological space X is connected if it is not the union of two non-empty, disjoint sets, which are open in the induced topology. The component of a point x in a topological space X is the union of all connected subsets of X containing x . It is not difficult to show that each component is connected and therefore the component of an element x is the largest connected subset of X containing x . Intuitively, a set is connected if it is of one piece.

Definition 2.1 *Let be given an economy $\mathcal{E} = (\{X^i, u^i, \omega^i\}_{i=1}^m)$ with continuous total excess demand function $z : S^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and let $v \in S^n$ be a starting price system. Then the price adjustment process is given by the component of the set C containing the starting price system v .*

Since in the definition of the price adjustment process under consideration no differentiability assumptions are used, one should also give a definition of convergence without using such assumptions. A subset T of \mathbf{R}^k is called an arc if it is homeomorphic to the unit interval $[0, 1]$. A subset T of \mathbf{R}^k is called a loop if it is homeomorphic to the unit circle, i.e., the set $\{x \in \mathbf{R}^2 \mid (x_1)^2 + (x_2)^2 = 1\}$.

Definition 2.2 *Let be given an economy $\mathcal{E} = (\{X^i, u^i, \omega^i\}_{i=1}^m)$ with continuous total excess demand function $z : S^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and let $v \in S^n$ be a starting price system. If $z(v) \neq 0^{n+1}$ then the price adjustment process is convergent if the component of the set C containing v is an arc having v and a Walrasian equilibrium price system p^* of the economy \mathcal{E} as its boundary points, whereas the arc does not contain another Walrasian equilibrium price system.*

In the next section it is proved that generically the price adjustment process is convergent. If the price adjustment process is convergent then there exists a continuous function $\pi : [0, 1] \rightarrow C$ which is one-one and satisfying that $\pi(0) = v$ and $\pi(1)$ is a Walrasian equilibrium price system, so $z(\pi(1)) = 0^{n+1}$. Moreover, $\pi([0, 1])$ is the component of C containing v . So there exists a unique, continuous path of price systems leading from the starting price system v to a Walrasian equilibrium price system. An element of the set

$[0, 1]$ could be considered as a normalized time parameter. Although the arc $\pi([0, 1])$ is uniquely determined, the function π is clearly not unique, and different functions correspond to different speeds of adjustment. The adjustment process is therefore described by considering explicitly the followed path of price systems. In case an adjustment process is implicitly defined by a system of differential equations, this path corresponds to its trajectory. Notice that it is only required that the arc contains some Walrasian equilibrium price system, which means that even if the starting price system is "sufficiently close" to an equilibrium price system, the adjustment process may converge to another equilibrium. So in the terminology of Saari and Simon (1978) or Saari (1985) Definition 2.2 corresponds to an effective or globally convergent mechanism, but not to a locally effective or locally convergent mechanism.

The adjustment process can be followed numerically arbitrarily close using the $(2^{n+1} - 2)$ -ray algorithm described in Doup, van der Laan, and Talman (1987). This algorithm generates a piecewise linear path of points corresponding with the adjustment process for a piecewise linear approximation of the total excess demand function. The information needed at some price system p reached by the algorithm is given by a finite number (at most $n + 1$) of price systems already generated by the algorithm, the excess demands at these price systems, and the starting price system v . This means that the amount of information needed is roughly the same as the amount indicated by Saari and Simon (1978).

In case of differentiability the approach taken above is related to the one of Kellog, Li, and Yorke (1976), Smale (1976, 1981), and Kamiya (1990). In Smale (1976) commodity $n + 1$ is considered to be a numeraire commodity and a process is defined which follows price systems in the set

$$\{p \in \mathbf{R}_+^n \mid \exists \lambda \in \mathbf{R}_+, \forall k \in I_n, z_k((p^\top, 1)^\top) = \lambda z_k((v^\top, 1)^\top)\},$$

with v the initial values of the prices of the first n commodities. It is easily verified that taking $\lambda = 1$ yields that $p = v$ is an element of the set, and taking $\lambda = 0$ yields that p^* is an element of the set if $(p^{*\top}, 1)^\top$ is a Walrasian equilibrium price system. Define $T^n = \{p \in \mathbf{R}_+^n \mid \sum_{j=1}^n (p_j)^2 \leq 1\}$. In Kamiya (1990) an adjustment process is defined generating prices in the set

$$\{p \in T^n \mid \exists \lambda \in [0, 1], \forall k \in I_n, (1 - \lambda)z_k((p^\top, (1 - \sum_{j=1}^n (p_j)^2)^{\frac{1}{2}})^\top) = \lambda(p_k - v_k)\},$$

with v the initial values of the prices of the first n commodities. It is easily verified that $\lambda = 1$ yields $p = v$ as unique solution. By considering $\lambda = 0$ it follows that p^* is in the set if $(p^{*\top}, \sqrt{1 - \sum_{j=1}^n p_j^{*2}})^\top$ is an equilibrium price system. By making suitable differentiability, regularity, and boundary conditions it can be shown that for the adjustment processes of Smale (1976) and Kamiya (1990) the components containing the starting price system v

of the sets defined above are arcs which can be described by continuously differentiable functions. Such a continuously differentiable arc can be described by a system of differential equations, see for example Garcia and Zangwill (1981), which corresponds to the system of differential equations given in Smale (1976) and Kamiya (1990).

The price adjustment process considered in this paper has a nice economic interpretation and can be described as follows. First the sign of the excess demand is evaluated at the starting price system v . Consider the case where for every $j \in I_{n+1}$, $z_j(v) \neq 0$. In Section 3 this will be shown to be the generic case. Prices of commodities $j \in I_{n+1}$ with $z_j(v) < 0$ will be decreased relatively, while prices of commodities $j \in I_{n+1}$ with $z_j(v) > 0$ will be increased relatively. Define the sign vector $s^0 \in \mathcal{S}$ by $s_j^0 = +1$ if $z_j(v) > 0$ and $s_j^0 = -1$ if $z_j(v) < 0$. So the process starts by leaving v along the ray $A(s^0)$ of price systems. The ratio of prices of commodities in excess demand is kept constant among those in excess demand, and similarly for the ratio of prices of commodities in excess supply. Prices are adjusted in this way until one of the markets, say market k , attains an equilibrium situation. Assume that there is a single market which attains an equilibrium. This will be shown to be the generic case. Then the process continues by keeping market k in equilibrium, while the price p_k is relatively increased (decreased) in case there was a negative (positive) excess demand on market k before attaining equilibrium. Other prices are kept relatively minimal in case of excess supply and relatively maximal in case of excess demand. Hence a path in $C(s^1)$ is followed, where $s_k^1 = 0$ and $s_j^1 = s_j^0$, $\forall j \in I_{n+1} \setminus \{k\}$. It will be shown in Section 2 that for every $s \in \mathcal{S}$ the set $C(s)$ is compact and in Section 3 that generically it is a finite collection of arcs and loops. Two situations now can occur at the other end point of the path in $C(s^1)$. Either another market, say market k' , attains an equilibrium situation. In this case prices are adjusted in such a way that markets k and k' are kept in equilibrium, while the price on market k' is relatively increased (decreased) in case there was a negative (positive) excess demand on market k' before attaining equilibrium. Again, other prices are kept either relatively minimal or relatively maximal. Hence a path of price systems in $C(s^2)$ is followed, where $s_k^2 = 0$ and $s_j^2 = s_j^1$, $\forall j \in I_{n+1} \setminus \{k'\}$. Or the price on market k becomes relatively minimal or maximal. In this case market k is no longer kept in equilibrium but is allowed to become in excess supply or excess demand, while p_k is kept relatively minimal or relatively maximal, respectively. So then a path of prices in $C(s^2)$ is followed, where $s_k^2 = -1$ or $+1$ and $s_j^2 = s_j^1$, $\forall j \in I_{n+1} \setminus \{k\}$.

The general case is as follows. Suppose the process follows a path of prices in $C(s^l)$ for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Then at the end point either market $k \in I^-(s^l) \cup I^+(s^l)$ attains an equilibrium situation, in which case a path of price systems in $C(s^{l+1})$ is followed, where $s_k^{l+1} = 0$ and $s_j^{l+1} = s_j^l$, $\forall j \in I_{n+1} \setminus \{k\}$. Or the price of some commodity $k \in I^0(s^l)$ becomes relatively minimal (maximal) in which case a path of prices in $C(s^{l+1})$ is followed, where $s_k^{l+1} = -1$ ($s_k^{l+1} = +1$) and $s_j^{l+1} = s_j^l$, $\forall j \in I_{n+1} \setminus \{k\}$. It will be shown that the process described

above generically converges to a Walrasian equilibrium price system.

In the Walrasian tatonnement process as formulated in Samuelson (1941), i.e., $p(0) = v$ and $\frac{dp(t)}{dt} = z(p(t))$, it is possible that after some time the adjustment process reaches a price system which is such that the price of a commodity is higher than the starting price while there is an excess supply on the market of this commodity. Similarly it can happen that the Walrasian tatonnement process reaches a price system at which there is an excess demand on the market of a commodity, while the price of this commodity is lower than the starting price of this commodity. This is a remarkable phenomenon since initially the Walrasian tatonnement process changes prices in such a way that prices of commodities in excess supply are lowered and prices of commodities in excess demand are raised with respect to the starting price system. Any price system on the path generated by the adjustment process in this paper has the natural property that the price of a commodity in excess demand is higher than the corresponding starting price, while a price of a commodity in excess supply is lower than the corresponding starting price. More details concerning the economic interpretation of the price adjustment process can be found in van der Laan and Talman (1987) and van den Elzen (1993).

The price adjustment process can be illustrated using the first example in Scarf (1960) concerning an exchange economy with three commodities. For this example it is well-known that the Walrasian tatonnement process is instable for every starting price system except for the unique Walrasian equilibrium price system. In Scarf's example initial endowments ω^i and utility functions u^i are specified for three consumers yielding a total excess demand function of the economy, $z : S^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$, which is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} z_1(p) &= \frac{-p_2}{p_1 + p_2} + \frac{p_3}{p_1 + p_3}, \quad \forall p \in S^2, \\ z_2(p) &= \frac{-p_3}{p_2 + p_3} + \frac{p_1}{p_1 + p_2}, \quad \forall p \in S^2, \\ z_3(p) &= \frac{-p_1}{p_1 + p_3} + \frac{p_2}{p_2 + p_3}, \quad \forall p \in S^2. \end{aligned}$$

The unique Walrasian equilibrium price system is given by $p^* = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})^\top$. It is easily verified that $z_1(p) = 0$ iff $p_2 = p_3$, $z_2(p) = 0$ iff $p_1 = p_3$, $z_3(p) = 0$ iff $p_1 = p_2$. Consider the starting price system $v = (\frac{11}{18}, \frac{2}{18}, \frac{5}{18})^\top$. In Figure I the sets $A(s)$ and $B(s)$ are drawn for every $s \in S$. In Figure II the set C is depicted. In Scarf's example there is an excess demand on the markets of the first two commodities at $v = (\frac{11}{18}, \frac{2}{18}, \frac{5}{18})^\top$. The process therefore starts by following a path in $C((+1, +1, -1)^\top)$, having v as a boundary point. So the prices of the first two commodities are relatively increased. At $p = (\frac{11}{15}, \frac{2}{15}, \frac{2}{15})^\top$ the market of the first commodity attains an equilibrium situation. So this market is kept in equilibrium, the relative price of the second commodity is kept maximal, and the relative price of the third commodity minimal, so a path in $C((0, +1, -1)^\top)$ is followed.




Figure I. The sets $A(s)$ and $B(s)$, $s \in S$, in the first example of Scarf (1960).

At $p = (\frac{11}{21}, \frac{5}{21}, \frac{5}{21})^T$ the price of the first commodity becomes relatively minimal and equal to the relative price of commodity 3. Hence the process continues by following a path in $C((-1, +1, -1)^T)$, where the prices of commodities 1 and 3 are relatively decreased and the price of commodity 2 is relatively increased. The market of commodity 1 is no longer in equilibrium. At $p = (\frac{11}{27}, \frac{11}{27}, \frac{5}{27})^T$ market 3 attains an equilibrium situation and so a path in $C((-1, +1, 0)^T)$ is followed. At $p^* = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})^T$ the process reaches a Walrasian equilibrium price system. Clearly the price adjustment process is convergent in the sense of Definition 2.2. It can be shown that in Scarf's example the price adjustment process converges for every starting price system $v \in S^n$.

In order to show that convergence is a generic property of the adjustment process, the following standard assumptions on consumption sets, and preferences have to be made.

- A1.** For every $i \in I_m$ the consumption set X^i is equal to \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} .
- A2.** For every $i \in I_m$ the utility function $u^i : X^i \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is strictly increasing, strictly quasi-concave, three times continuously differentiable, the indifference surfaces of u^i have non-zero Gaussian curvature at every $x^i \in X^i$, and the closure of the indifference surfaces in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} is a subset of \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} .

If the economy \mathcal{E} satisfies Assumptions A1 and A2, and for every consumer $i \in I_m$ it holds that $\omega^i \in X^i$, then the total excess demand function $z : S^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ is twice continuously differentiable on S^n . Let be given m consumption sets and utility functions, $(\{X^i, u^i\}_{i=1}^m)$, and a starting price system $v \in S^n$. Denote $\Omega = \prod_{i=1}^m X^i$. Define the set of regular initial endowments, denoted by Ω^* , as the set of initial endowments $\omega \in \Omega$ for which the components of the set C for the economy $\mathcal{E} = (\{X^i, u^i, \omega^i\}_{i=1}^m)$ with starting




Figure II. The set C in the first example of Scarf (1960).

price system v are given by (1) a unique arc containing v and one Walrasian equilibrium price system which are boundary points of the arc, (2) a finite number of arcs containing two Walrasian equilibrium price systems both being boundary points, and (3) a finite number of loops containing no Walrasian equilibrium price systems.

Theorem 2.3 *Let be given $(\{X^i, u^i\}_{i=1}^m)$ satisfying Assumptions A1 and A2, and let $v \in S^n$ be a starting price system. Then the set of non-regular initial endowments $\Omega \setminus \Omega^*$ has a closure in Ω with Lebesgue measure zero.*

Theorem 2.3 will be proved in Section 3. In fact, the proof of Theorem 2.3 yields that the path of prices followed by the price adjustment process is a 1-dimensional piecewise twice continuously differentiable manifold, i.e., a 1-dimensional continuous manifold which is a finite union of twice continuously differentiable manifolds, some possibly of lower dimensions. Moreover, the other components of the set C are either loops or arcs, both being 1-dimensional piecewise twice continuously differentiable manifolds. Since $\omega \in \Omega^*$ implies that the price adjustment process converges, Theorem 2.3 immediately implies the next result.

Corollary 2.4 *Let be given $(\{X^i, u^i\}_{i=1}^m)$ satisfying Assumptions A1 and A2, and let $v \in S^n$ be a starting price system. Then the price adjustment process for the economy $\mathcal{E} = (\{X^i, u^i, \omega^i\}_{i=1}^m)$ with starting price system v converges, except for a set of initial endowments in Ω having a closure in Ω with Lebesgue measure zero.*

Since every Walrasian equilibrium price system is an element of C , Theorem 2.3 confirms

the well-known result of Dierker (1972) that generically there is an odd number of Walrasian equilibria in an economy.

Corollary 2.5 *Let be given $(\{X^i, u^i\}_{i=1}^m)$ satisfying Assumptions A1 and A2. Then the number of Walrasian equilibria of the economy $\mathcal{E} = (\{X^i, u^i, \omega^i\}_{i=1}^m)$ is a finite, odd number, except for a set of initial endowments in Ω having a closure in Ω with Lebesgue measure zero.*

Let be given $(\{X^i, u^i\}_{i=1}^m)$ and a starting price system $v \in S^n$. For every $\omega \in \Omega$ define the set $P(\omega)$ as the component of the set C containing v , define for every $s \in \mathcal{S}$ the set $Q_s(\omega)$ as the set $C(s)$, and define the set $Q(\omega)$ as the set C for the economy $\mathcal{E} = (\{X^i, u^i, \omega^i\}_{i=1}^m)$ with starting price system v . In this way one obtains the price adjustment process correspondence $P : \Omega \rightarrow S^n$ and a correspondence $Q : \Omega \rightarrow S^n$. Notice that the price adjustment correspondence P and the correspondence Q are non-empty valued since for every $\omega \in \Omega$ the starting price system v is contained in $P(\omega) \subset Q(\omega)$. To make clear the dependence of the total excess demand on the initial endowments, some additional notation is needed. Let $\delta^i(p, w^i)$ denote the demand of consumer $i \in I_m$ at price system $p \in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1}$ and wealth $w^i \in \mathbf{R}_{++}$. The total excess demand function $\zeta : \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ is defined by $\zeta(p, \omega) = \sum_{i=1}^m \delta^i(p, p \cdot \omega^i) - \sum_{i=1}^m \omega^i$, $\forall (p, \omega) \in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} \times \Omega$. For a non-empty compact set $T \subset \mathbf{R}^k$ define the function $d_T : \mathbf{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by $d_T(t') = \min\{\|t' - t\|_\infty \mid t \in T\}$, $\forall t' \in \mathbf{R}^k$. It is not difficult to show that d_T is a continuous function. For two non-empty compact subsets T^1 and T^2 of \mathbf{R}^k define $e(T^1, T^2) = \min\{\|t^1 - t^2\|_\infty \mid t^1 \in T^1, t^2 \in T^2\}$. If T^1 and T^2 are disjoint then obviously $e(T^1, T^2) > 0$.

Theorem 2.6 *Let be given $(\{X^i, u^i\}_{i=1}^m)$ satisfying Assumptions A1 and A2, and let $v \in S^n$ be a starting price system. Then the correspondences P and Q are compact-valued and upper semi-continuous.*

Proof First the correspondence Q is shown to be upper semi-continuous and compact-valued. Let $(\omega^q)_{q \in \mathbf{N}}$ be a sequence in Ω converging to $\bar{\omega} \in \Omega$ and let $(p^q)_{q \in \mathbf{N}}$ be a sequence in S^n such that $p^q \in Q(\omega^q)$. It will be shown that $(p^q)_{q \in \mathbf{N}}$ has a subsequence which converges to a point $\bar{p} \in Q(\bar{\omega})$. Since \bar{S}^n is compact $(p^q)_{q \in \mathbf{N}}$ has a subsequence $(p^{q^r})_{r \in \mathbf{N}}$ converging to a point $\bar{p} \in \bar{S}^n$. Moreover, since the set of sign vectors \mathcal{S} is finite the subsequence can be taken such that $\exists s \in \mathcal{S}$, $\forall r \in \mathbf{N}$, $p^{q^r} \in Q_s(\omega^{q^r})$. Clearly, if $j \in I^+(s)$ then $p_j^{q^r} \geq v_j$. Notice that $\forall r \in \mathbf{N}$, if $j \in I^-(s)$ then $\zeta_j(p^{q^r}, \omega^{q^r}) \leq 0$, if $j \in I^0(s)$ then $\zeta_j(p^{q^r}, \omega^{q^r}) = 0$, and if $j \in I^+(s)$ then $\zeta_j(p^{q^r}, \omega^{q^r}) \geq 0$. Consequently, it holds for every $r \in \mathbf{N}$ that

$$\|\zeta(p^{q^r}, \omega^{q^r})\|_\infty = \max \left\{ \max_{j \in I^-(s)} -\zeta_j(p^{q^r}, \omega^{q^r}), \max_{j \in I^+(s)} \zeta_j(p^{q^r}, \omega^{q^r}) \right\}$$

$$\leq \max \left\{ \sup_{r \in \mathbb{N}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \omega^{i q^r} \right\|_{\infty}, \frac{\sup_{r \in \mathbb{N}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \omega^{i q^r} \right\|_{\infty}}{\min_{j \in I+(s)} v_j} \right\}.$$

Notice that the right-hand side of the inequality above is finite. Suppose $\bar{p} \in \bar{S}^n \setminus S^n$. Then Assumptions A1 and A2 imply that $\|\zeta(p^{q^r}, \omega^{q^r})\|_{\infty}$ goes to infinity if $p^{q^r} \rightarrow \bar{p} \in \bar{S}^n \setminus S^n$ and $\omega^{q^r} \rightarrow \bar{\omega} \in \Omega$, and a contradiction is obtained. Using $p^{q^r} \rightarrow \bar{p} \in S^n$, $\omega^{q^r} \rightarrow \bar{\omega} \in \Omega$, and the continuity of ζ it follows that $\bar{p} \in Q_s(\bar{\omega})$. So Q is upper semi-continuous and compact-valued.

Now let $(\omega^q)_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in Ω converging to $\bar{\omega} \in \Omega$ and let $(p^q)_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in S^n such that $p^q \in P(\omega^q)$. It will be shown that $(p^q)_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a subsequence which converges to a point $\bar{p} \in P(\bar{\omega})$. Without loss of generality it can be assumed that, using the previous paragraph, $p^q \rightarrow \bar{p}$ with $\bar{p} \in Q(\bar{\omega})$. Since $P(\bar{\omega})$ is the largest connected subset of $Q(\bar{\omega})$ containing v , the closure of a connected set is connected, and since $Q(\bar{\omega})$ is compact, it follows that $P(\bar{\omega})$ is compact.

Exercise 4c of Section 5.1 in Munkres (1975, p.235) states that for a compact Hausdorff space X and an element $x \in X$ the component of X containing x equals the intersection of all sets containing x which are both open and closed in X . Suppose $\bar{p} \notin P(\bar{\omega})$. Using the result mentioned above and the compactness of $P(\bar{\omega})$ it follows that there exist compact disjoint sets T^1 and T^2 such that $v \in T^1$, $\bar{p} \in T^2$, and $T^1 \cup T^2 = Q(\bar{\omega})$. Hence there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $e(T^1, T^2) > \varepsilon$. By the upper semi-continuity of the correspondence Q there exists an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\forall q \geq N$, $\forall p \in P(\omega^q)$, $d_{Q(\bar{\omega})}(p) < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$. Consider some $q \geq N$ such that $\|p^q - \bar{p}\|_{\infty} < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$. Define $U^1 = \{p \in P(\omega^q) \mid d_{T^1}(p) < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\}$ and $U^2 = \{p \in P(\omega^q) \mid d_{T^2}(p) < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\}$. By the continuity of d_{T^1} and d_{T^2} the sets U^1 and U^2 are open in $P(\omega^q)$. Clearly U^1 and U^2 are disjoint, $U^1 \cup U^2 = P(\omega^q)$, and U^1 and U^2 are non-empty since $v \in U^1$ and $p^q \in U^2$. So $P(\omega^q)$ is not connected, a contradiction. Q.E.D.

The correspondences P and Q are compact-valued and upper-semicontinuous, and the image set S^n is totally bounded when given the Euclidean metric, i.e., for every $\varepsilon > 0$, $S^n \subset \mathbb{R}_{++}^{n+1}$ can be covered by a finite number of sets of diameter less than ε . Therefore it follows immediately, in the same way as in Dierker (1974, p.85), that the correspondences P and Q are continuous on a residual subset of Ω , i.e., on a countable intersection of sets open and dense in Ω . Therefore, from an economic point of view, Theorem 2.6 is interesting since it means that the adjustment process itself is in some sense stable against perturbations in the initial endowments. The upper semi-continuity and the compact-valuedness of Q will be used in the proof of Theorem 2.3.

3 Generic Convergence of the Process

In this section consumption sets and utility functions $(\{X^i, u^i\}_{i=1}^m)$ satisfying Assumptions A1 and A2, and a starting price system $v \in S^n$ are given. Then for every $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$ the sets $B(s)$, $C(s)$, and C for the economy $\mathcal{E} = (\{X^i, u^i, \omega^i\}_{i=1}^m)$ with starting price system v can be derived. To make clear the dependence on the initial endowments, notation is changed in this section to $B_\omega(s)$, $C_\omega(s)$, and C_ω , respectively.

For some $r \geq 1$ a subset M of \mathbf{R}^k is called a C^r l -dimensional manifold with generalized boundary (MGB), if for every $\bar{x} \in M$ there exists a local C^r coordinate system of \mathbf{R}^k around \bar{x} , i.e., a C^r diffeomorphism $\varphi: U \rightarrow V$ where U is an open subset of \mathbf{R}^k containing \bar{x} and V is open in \mathbf{R}^k , and some $b(\bar{x}) \geq 0$ such that $\varphi(\bar{x}) = 0^k$ and $\varphi(U \cap M)$ equals

$$\{(y_1, \dots, y_{k-l}, y_{k-l+1}, \dots, y_{k-l+1+b(\bar{x})}, \dots, y_k)^T \in V \mid y_1 = \dots = y_{k-l} = 0, y_{k-l+1} \geq 0, \dots, y_{k-l+b(\bar{x})} \geq 0\}.$$

If for every element \bar{x} of an MGB M , $b(\bar{x}) \leq 1$, then M is called a manifold with boundary and it is easily shown that the set of elements \bar{x} for which $b(\bar{x}) = 1$ is an $l-1$ dimensional manifold, called the boundary of M . Let J^1 and J^2 be two finite index sets and let g_j , $\forall j \in J^1$, and h_j , $\forall j \in J^2$, be C^r functions defined on some open subset X of \mathbf{R}^k . Define

$$M[g, h] = \{x \in X \mid g_j(x) = 0, \forall j \in J^1, h_j(x) \geq 0, \forall j \in J^2\}.$$

For $x \in X$ define $J^0(x) = \{j \in J^2 \mid h_j(x) = 0\}$. If for every $\bar{x} \in M[g, h]$ it holds that $\{\partial g_j(\bar{x}), \forall j \in J^1, \partial h_j(\bar{x}), \forall j \in J^0(\bar{x})\}$ is a set of independent vectors then $M[g, h]$ is called a C^r regular constraint set (RCS). In Jongen, Jonker, and Twilt (1982, Lemma 3.1.2, Example 3.1.3) it is shown that every C^r RCS is a $(k - |J^1|)$ -dimensional C^r MGB with for every $\bar{x} \in M[g, h]$, $b(\bar{x}) = |J^0(\bar{x})|$.

Let some sign vector $s \in \mathcal{S}$ be given. Without loss of generality it can be assumed that $I^0(s) = I_{k^0(s)}$, $I^-(s) = I_{k^0(s)+k^-(s)} \setminus I_{k^0(s)}$, and $I^+(s) = I_{n+1} \setminus I_{k^0(s)+k^-(s)}$. Let some $j^- \in I^-(s)$ and $j^+ \in I^+(s)$ be given. The price system p is an element of the set $C_\omega(s)$ if and only if the element $(p, \omega) \in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} \times \Omega$ satisfies

$$\zeta_j(p, \omega) = 0, \forall j \in I^0(s), \quad (1)$$

$$p_j v_{j+1} - p_{j+1} v_j = 0, \forall j \in I_{k^0(s)+k^-(s)-1} \setminus I_{k^0(s)}, \quad (2)$$

$$p_j v_{j+1} - p_{j+1} v_j = 0, \forall j \in I_n \setminus I_{k^0(s)+k^-(s)}, \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n+1} p_j - 1 = 0, \quad (4)$$

$$-\zeta_j(p, \omega) \geq 0, \forall j \in I^-(s), \quad (5)$$

$$\zeta_j(p, \omega) \geq 0, \forall j \in I^+(s), \text{ if } k^0(s) \leq n-2, \quad (6)$$

$$p_j v_{j-} - p_{j-} v_j \geq 0, \forall j \in I^0(s), \quad (7)$$

$$p_j + v_j - p_j v_{j+} \geq 0, \quad \forall j \in I^0(s), \quad (8)$$

$$p_j + v_{j-} - p_j - v_{j+} \geq 0. \quad (9)$$

Notice that if $k^-(s) = 1$ then no constraints are specified in (2). The same holds with respect to (3) if $k^+(s) = 1$. Since $k^-(s)$ and $k^+(s)$ are both greater than or equal to one, there are all together n equations in (1)-(4). If $k^0(s) > n - 2$, or equivalently $k^0(s) = n - 1$, then $k^-(s) = k^+(s) = 1$. In this case the inequality in (6) follows by Walras' law from inequality (5) and therefore inequality (6) is not specified in this case. It will be shown in the following that for a given generic $\omega \in \Omega$ (1)-(9) constitute a 1-dimensional C^2 RCS.

In order to show Theorem 2.3 it is useful to define for every $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$ a set $D_\omega(s)$ as follows:

$$D_\omega(s) = \left\{ p \in S^n \left| \frac{p_j}{v_j} = \frac{p_{j'}}{v_{j'}} \text{ if } j, j' \in I^-(s), \zeta_j(p, \omega) = 0 \text{ if } j \in I^0(s), \text{ and } \frac{p_j}{v_j} = \frac{p_{j'}}{v_{j'}} \text{ if } j, j' \in I^+(s) \right. \right\}.$$

Clearly, $C_\omega(s) \subset D_\omega(s)$. The difference between these two sets is that no inequality constraints are taken into account in the specification of $D_\omega(s)$. In Lemma 3.1 it is shown that except for a set of initial endowments of Lebesgue measure zero the set $D_\omega(s)$ is a C^2 1-dimensional manifold. Hence it consists of a number of disjoint sets which are diffeomorphic to either a unit circle or an open unit interval. The function $\psi_s : \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ is defined such that $\psi_s(p, \omega)$ is the left-hand side of (1)-(4). Define $\psi_{s,\omega} : \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ by $\psi_{s,\omega}(p) = \psi_s(p, \omega)$, $\forall p \in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1}$. Notice that $D_\omega(s) = \psi_{s,\omega}^{-1}(\{0^n\})$.

Lemma 3.1 *Let be given $(\{X^i, u^i\}_{i=1}^m)$ satisfying Assumptions A1 and A2, and let $v \in S^n$ be a starting price system. Moreover, let be given a sign vector $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Then $\psi_{s,\omega} \not\equiv \{0^n\}$ and $D_\omega(s)$ is a C^2 1-dimensional manifold, except for a set of initial endowments $\omega \in \Omega$ with Lebesgue measure zero.*

Proof The matrix of partial derivatives of ψ_s evaluated at a point $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega})$ satisfying $\psi_s(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega}) = 0^n$ is denoted by M and is given in Table I. Moreover, in Table I two submatrices M^1 and M^2 of M are defined. It will be shown that the matrix M has rank n . First it is proved that for every $i \in I_m$, $\partial_{\omega^i} \zeta(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega})$ has rank n . Notice that $\tilde{p}^\top \partial_{\omega^i} \zeta(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega}) = 0^{n+1^\top}$ and $\partial_{\omega^i} \zeta(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega}) = \partial_{\omega^i} \delta^i(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega}) \tilde{p}^\top - I^{n+1}$, where I^{n+1} denotes the $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ identity matrix. For $j \in I_{n+1}$ let e^j denote the $(n+1)$ -dimensional unit vector with $e_j^j = 1$. Then $\partial_{\omega^i} \zeta(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega})(\tilde{p}_{j'} e^j - \tilde{p}_j e^{j'}) = \tilde{p}_{j'} e^{j'} - \tilde{p}_j e^j$, $\forall j, j' \in I_{n+1}$, and so the rank of $\partial_{\omega^i} \zeta(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega})$ is equal to n . Consider the first $k^0(s)$ rows of $\partial_{\omega^i} \zeta(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega})$. These rows have to be independent. Suppose not, then $k^0(s) \leq n - 1$ implies the existence of $y \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ such that $y_n = y_{n+1} = 0$ and $y^\top \partial_{\omega^i} \zeta(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega}) = 0^{n+1^\top}$. Since $\tilde{p}^\top \partial_{\omega^i} \zeta(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega}) = 0^{n+1^\top}$ this implies that the rank of $\partial_{\omega^i} \zeta(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega})$ is less than or equal to $n - 1$, a contradiction.

Now let $y \in \mathbf{R}^n$ be such that $y^\top M = 0^{(m+1)(n+1)^\top}$. By the previous paragraph $y^\top \partial_{\omega^i} \psi_s(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega}) = 0^{n+1^\top}$ implies $y_j = 0$, $\forall j \in I_{k^0(s)}$. Suppose $y_n \neq 0$. Without loss of generality it can be assumed that $y_n < 0$. If $k^0(s) \geq 1$ or if $k^-(s) = 1$ then a contradiction is obtained with $y^\top \partial_{p_1} \psi_s(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega}) = 0$. If $k^0(s) = 0$ and $k^-(s) \geq 2$ then $y_n < 0$ and $y^\top \partial_{p_1} \psi_s(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega}) = 0$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}
M &= \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \partial_p \zeta_1(\tilde{p}, \tilde{w}) & & & \partial_\omega \zeta_1(\tilde{p}, \tilde{w}) \\ \hline \vdots & & & \vdots \\ \hline \partial_p \zeta_{k^0(s)}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{w}) & & & \partial_\omega \zeta_{k^0(s)}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{w}) \\ \hline \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} k^0(s) \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 0^{(k^-(s)-1) \times k^0(s)} & M^1 & 0^{(k^-(s)-1) \times k^+(s)} & 0^{(k^-(s)-1) \times m(n+1)} \\ \hline \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} k^-(s) - 1 \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 0^{(k^+(s)-1) \times (k^0(s) + k^-(s))} & M^2 & 0^{(k^+(s)-1) \times m(n+1)} & \\ \hline \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} k^+(s) - 1 \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1^{n+1^T} & & 0^{m(n+1)^T} & \\ \hline \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} n+1 \\ m(n+1) \end{array}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
M^1 &= \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline v_{k^0(s)+2} & -v_{k^0(s)+1} & & & & 0^{k^-(s)-2^T} \\ \hline 0 & v_{k^0(s)+3} & -v_{k^0(s)+2} & & & 0^{k^-(s)-3^T} \\ \hline & & & \ddots & & \\ \hline & & & & v_{k^0(s)+k^-(s)-1} & -v_{k^0(s)+k^-(s)-2} & 0 \\ \hline & & 0^{k^-(s)-3^T} & & & & \\ \hline & & 0^{k^-(s)-2^T} & & & v_{k^0(s)+k^-(s)} & -v_{k^0(s)+k^-(s)-1} \\ \hline \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} k^-(s) - 1 \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
M^2 &= \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline v_{k^0(s)+k^-(s)+2} & -v_{k^0(s)+k^-(s)+1} & & & & 0^{k^+(s)-2^T} \\ \hline 0 & v_{k^0(s)+k^-(s)+3} & -v_{k^0(s)+k^-(s)+2} & & & 0^{k^+(s)-3^T} \\ \hline & & & \ddots & & \\ \hline & & & & 0^{k^+(s)-3^T} & v_n & -v_{n-1} & 0 \\ \hline & & & & 0^{k^+(s)-2^T} & v_{n+1} & -v_n & \\ \hline \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} k^+(s) - 1 \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}
\end{aligned}$$

Table I. The matrix M .

$y_1 > 0$. It is easily seen that $y_j > 0$ and $y^\top \partial_{p_{j+1}} \psi_s(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega}) = 0$ implies $y_{j+1} > 0$, $\forall j \in I_{k^-(s)-2}$. Hence $y_{k^-(s)-1} > 0$, implying that $y^\top \partial_{p_{k^-(s)}} \psi_s(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega}) < 0$, a contradiction. Consequently $y_n = 0$.

The independence of the rows of M^1 and of the rows of M^2 yields $y_{k^0(s)+1} = \dots = y_{n-1} = 0$. So M has rank n and consequently ψ_s is transverse to the origin: $\psi_s \not\propto \{0^n\}$. By the transversality theorem (see for example Theorem I.2.2 of Mas-Colell (1985)) and since ψ_s is a twice continuously differentiable function it follows that the complement of the set $\{\omega \in \Omega \mid \psi_{s,\omega} \propto \{0^n\}\}$ has Lebesgue measure zero. Since $\psi_{s,\omega}$ maps from a manifold with dimension $n+1$ into a manifold with dimension n and $\psi_{s,\omega}$ is a twice continuously differentiable function, $\psi_{s,\omega} \propto \{0^n\}$ implies that $\psi_{s,\omega}^{-1}(\{0^n\})$ and hence $D_\omega(s)$ is a C^2 1-dimensional manifold. Q.E.D.

For some given $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$ consider the set of price systems p in $D_\omega(s)$ satisfying $\zeta_k(p, \omega) = 0$ for some $k \in I^-(s) \cup I^+(s)$. Hence one of the inequalities in (5) or (6) is

satisfied with equality. If for \tilde{s} defined by $\tilde{s}_k = 0$ and $\tilde{s}_j = s_j$, $\forall j \in I_{n+1} \setminus \{k\}$, it holds that $\tilde{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ then these price systems are in the intersection of the sets $D_\omega(s)$ and $D_\omega(\tilde{s})$. Considering the system of equations defining $C_\omega(\tilde{s})$ it follows that one of the inequalities in (7) or (8) is satisfied with equality. For every $\omega \in \Omega$, $s \in \mathcal{S}$, and $k \in I^-(s) \cup I^+(s)$, define the set $D_\omega(s, k)$ as follows:

$$D_\omega(s, k) = \left\{ p \in S^n \left| \frac{p_j}{v_j} = \frac{p_{j'}}{v_{j'}} \text{ if } j, j' \in I^-(s), \zeta_j(p, \omega) = 0 \text{ if } j \in I^0(s) \cup \{k\}, \text{ and } \frac{p_j}{v_j} = \frac{p_{j'}}{v_{j'}} \text{ if } j, j' \in I^+(s) \right. \right\}.$$

In Lemma 3.2 it is shown that except for a set of initial endowments of Lebesgue measure zero the set $D_\omega(s, k)$ is a 0-dimensional manifold and hence a discrete set of points. Given a sign vector $s \in \mathcal{S}$ the commodities can be relabelled such that $I^0(s) = I_{k^0(s)}$, $I^-(s) = I_{k^0(s)+k^-(s)} \setminus I_{k^0(s)}$, and $I^+(s) = I_{n+1} \setminus I_{k^0(s)+k^-(s)}$. It is easily verified that the price system p is an element of the set $D_\omega(s, k)$ if and only if the element $(p, \omega) \in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} \times \Omega$ satisfies equations (1)-(4), and

$$\zeta_k(p, \omega) = 0. \quad (10)$$

Now a function $\psi_{s,k} : \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ is defined such that $\psi_{s,k}(p, \omega)$ is the left-hand side of (1)-(4) and (10). Define $\psi_{s,k,\omega} : \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ by $\psi_{s,k,\omega}(p) = \psi_{s,k}(p, \omega)$, $\forall p \in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1}$.

Lemma 3.2 *Let be given $(\{X^i, u^i\}_{i=1}^m)$ satisfying Assumptions A1 and A2, and let $v \in S^n$ be a starting price system. Moreover, let be given a sign vector $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and a commodity $k \in I^-(s) \cup I^+(s)$. Then $\psi_{s,k,\omega} \not\equiv \{0^{n+1}\}$ and $D_\omega(s, k)$ is a 0-dimensional manifold, except for a set of initial endowments $\omega \in \Omega$ with Lebesgue measure zero.*

Proof The matrix of partial derivatives of $\psi_{s,k}$ evaluated at a point $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega})$ satisfying $\psi_{s,k}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega}) = 0^{n+1}$ is denoted by \tilde{M} . It is shown that the matrix \tilde{M} has rank $n+1$. Let $y \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ satisfy $y^\top \tilde{M} = 0^{(m+1)(n+1)\top}$. As in the proof of Lemma 3.1 it can be shown that the rows $1, \dots, k^0(s), k$ of $\partial_{\omega^i} \zeta(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega})$ are independent for every $i \in I_m$, since $k^0(s) \leq n-1$ and $k \notin I^0(s)$. So $y^\top \partial_{\omega^1} \psi_{s,k}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\omega}) = 0^{n+1\top}$ implies $y_1 = \dots = y_{k^0(s)} = y_{n+1} = 0$. The proof that $y_{k^0(s)+1} = \dots = y_n = 0$ is now identical to the corresponding part of the proof of Lemma 3.1. Hence \tilde{M} has rank $n+1$ and $\psi_{s,k} \not\equiv \{0^{n+1}\}$. By the transversality theorem it follows that the complement of the set $\{\omega \in \Omega \mid \psi_{s,k,\omega} \not\equiv \{0^{n+1}\}\}$ has Lebesgue measure zero. Since $\psi_{s,k,\omega}$ maps from a manifold with dimension $n+1$ into a manifold with dimension $n+1$ and $\psi_{s,k,\omega}$ is a twice continuously differentiable function, $\psi_{s,k,\omega} \not\equiv \{0^{n+1}\}$ implies that $\psi_{s,k,\omega}^{-1}(\{0^{n+1}\})$ and hence $D_\omega(s, k)$ is a 0-dimensional manifold. Q.E.D.

For some sign vector $s \in \mathcal{S}$ with $k^0(s) \leq n-2$ and some $\omega \in \Omega$ consider the set of price systems $p \in D_\omega(s)$ satisfying $z_{k^1}(p) = z_{k^2}(p) = 0$ for some $k^1, k^2 \in I^-(s) \cup I^+(s)$ with $k^1 \neq k^2$. This set is denoted by $D_\omega(s, k^1, k^2)$. The next lemma shows that the set $D_\omega(s, k^1, k^2)$ is empty, except for a set of initial endowments of Lebesgue measure zero. Notice that the

condition $k^0(s) \leq n-2$ is crucial, since for a sign vector s with $k^0(s) = n-1$ a corresponding set $D_\omega(s, k^1, k^2)$ is equal to the set of Walrasian equilibrium price systems in $A(s)$ of the economy $\mathcal{E} = (\{X^i, u^i, \omega^i\}_{i=1}^m)$.

The price system p is an element of the set $D_\omega(s, k^1, k^2)$ if and only if the element $(p, \omega) \in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} \times \Omega$ satisfies equations (1)-(4) and

$$\zeta_{k^1}(p, \omega) = 0, \quad (11)$$

$$\zeta_{k^2}(p, \omega) = 0. \quad (12)$$

The function $\psi_{s, k^1, k^2} : \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+2}$ is defined such that $\psi_{s, k^1, k^2}(p, \omega)$ is the left-hand side of (1)-(4), (11), and (12). The function $\psi_{s, k^1, k^2, \omega} : \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+2}$ is defined by $\psi_{s, k^1, k^2, \omega}(p) = \psi_{s, k^1, k^2}(p, \omega)$, $\forall p \in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1}$.

Lemma 3.3 *Let be given $(\{X^i, u^i\}_{i=1}^m)$ satisfying Assumptions A1 and A2. Moreover, let be given a sign vector $s \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfying $k^0(s) \leq n-2$, two different commodities $k^1, k^2 \in I^-(s) \cup I^+(s)$, and a starting price system $v \in S^n$. Then $\psi_{s, k^1, k^2, \omega} \not\equiv \{0^{n+2}\}$ and $D_\omega(s, k^1, k^2)$ is empty, except for a set of initial endowments $\omega \in \Omega$ with Lebesgue measure zero.*

Proof Remark that $k^0(s) \leq n-2$ and $k^1, k^2 \notin I^0(s)$ implies that the rows $1, \dots, k^0(s), k^1$, and k^2 of $\partial_\omega \zeta(\bar{p}, \bar{\omega})$ are independent for every $i \in I_m$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 it can be shown that $\psi_{s, k^1, k^2} \not\equiv \{0^{n+2}\}$ and therefore the complement of the set $\{\omega \in \Omega \mid \psi_{s, k^1, k^2, \omega} \not\equiv \{0^{n+2}\}\}$ has Lebesgue measure zero. Since $\psi_{s, k^1, k^2, \omega}$ maps from an $n+1$ -dimensional manifold into an $n+2$ -dimensional manifold, $\psi_{s, k^1, k^2, \omega} \not\equiv \{0^{n+2}\}$ implies that $\psi_{s, k^1, k^2, \omega}^{-1}(\{0^{n+2}\})$ and hence $D_\omega(s, k^1, k^2)$ is an empty set by the definition of transversality. Q.E.D.

It holds that $v \in C_\omega(s)$ for a unique $s \in \mathcal{S}$ if and only if $\zeta_j(v, \omega) \neq 0$ for every $j \in I_{n+1}$. Therefore it is shown in Lemma 3.4 that, except for a set of initial endowments of Lebesgue measure zero, all components of the excess demand at price system v are unequal to zero. It is sufficient to show that the set of initial endowments for which the excess demand of one of the commodities is equal to zero at v has Lebesgue measure zero. Hence for given $j \in I_{n+1}$ define the function $\psi_j : \{v\} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by $\psi_j(v, \omega) = \zeta_j(v, \omega)$, $\forall \omega \in \Omega$. Define $\psi_{j, \omega} : \{v\} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by $\psi_{j, \omega}(v) = \psi_j(v, \omega)$.

Lemma 3.4 *Let be given $(\{X^i, u^i\}_{i=1}^m)$ satisfying Assumptions A1 and A2, and let $v \in S^n$ be a starting price system. Then for every $j \in I_{n+1}$, $\psi_{j, \omega} \not\equiv \{0\}$ and $\zeta_j(v, \omega) \neq 0$, except for a set of initial endowments $\omega \in \Omega$ with Lebesgue measure zero.*

Proof Clearly it holds that $\psi_j \not\equiv \{0\}$. So the complement of the set $\{\omega \in \Omega \mid \psi_{j, \omega} \not\equiv \{0\}\}$ has Lebesgue measure zero. Since $\psi_{j, \omega}$ maps from a 0-dimensional manifold into a

1-dimensional manifold, $\psi_{j,\omega}(v) \not\in \{0\}$ implies that $\psi_{j,\omega}^{-1}(\{0\})$ is an empty set by the definition of transversality. Q.E.D.

Now all preliminary work has been done to give a proof of Theorem 2.3. The proof consists of three parts. In the first part it is shown that for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$ the set $C_\omega(s)$ is a compact C^2 1-dimensional manifold with boundary for every $s \in \mathcal{S}$. In the second part the sets $C_\omega(s)$ are linked together and it is shown that for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$ the set C_ω consists of a finite number of arcs and loops. There is a unique arc having the starting price system v and a unique Walrasian equilibrium price system as boundary points. The other arcs have two Walrasian equilibrium price systems as boundary points. In part three of the proof it is shown that the closure of the set of initial endowments for which the result of the second part does not hold has Lebesgue measure zero.

Proof of Theorem 2.3 Let $\omega \in \Omega$ be given satisfying, for every $j \in I_{n+1}$, $\psi_{j,\omega} \not\in \{0\}$, for every $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $\psi_{s,\omega} \not\in \{0^n\}$, $\forall k \in I^-(s) \cup I^+(s)$, $\psi_{s,k,\omega} \not\in \{0^{n+1}\}$, and for every $s \in \mathcal{S}$ with $k^0(s) \leq n-2$, $\forall k^1, k^2 \in I^-(s) \cup I^+(s)$ with $k^1 \neq k^2$, $\psi_{s,k^1,k^2,\omega} \not\in \{0^{n+2}\}$. By Lemmas 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4, almost every element of Ω satisfies this finite number of requirements.

1. $C_\omega(s)$ is a compact C^2 1-dimensional manifold with boundary $\forall s \in \mathcal{S}$.

It is shown that when the left-hand sides of equations (1)-(9) are considered as functions of p from the open set \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} into \mathbf{R} that they yield a 1-dimensional C^2 RCS. Let $\bar{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ be given and let $\bar{p} \in C_\omega(\bar{s})$.

If $\bar{p} = v$ then since for every $j \in I_{n+1}$, $\psi_{j,\omega} \not\in \{0\}$, it holds that $I^0(\bar{s}) = \emptyset$ and the inequalities (5) and (6) are not binding. Hence $J^0(\bar{p})$ consists of a unique element corresponding with equation (9). It is easily verified that the derivatives with respect to p of (2)-(4) and (9) at \bar{p} constitute an independent set of vectors.

Consider the case with $\bar{p} \neq v$. Then (9) holds with inequality. Suppose that two (or more) equations in (5)-(8) hold with equality. Since $\bar{p} \neq v$, (7) and (8) cannot be binding for the same commodity in $I^0(\bar{s})$ and therefore the two equations holding with equality correspond to different commodities $k^1, k^2 \in I_{n+1}$. Define \tilde{s} by $\tilde{s}_j = \bar{s}_j$, $\forall j \in I_{n+1} \setminus \{k^1, k^2\}$ and for $i \in I_2$, $\tilde{s}_{k^i} = -1$ if k^i corresponds to an equation in (5) or (7), and $\tilde{s}_{k^i} = +1$ if k^i corresponds to an equation in (6) or (8). If for some $i \in I_2$, k^i corresponds to (7) or (8), or if $k^0(\tilde{s}) \leq n-2$, then $k^0(\tilde{s}) \leq n-2$. Moreover, $\bar{p} \in D_\omega(\tilde{s}, k^1, k^2)$, a contradiction since $\psi_{\tilde{s},k^1,k^2,\omega} \not\in \{0^{n+2}\}$. So $k^0(\tilde{s}) = n-1$ and k^1, k^2 correspond to two different equations in (5) and (6), again leading to a contradiction since there is only one equation specified in (5) and (6) in this case. Consequently at most one of the inequalities in (5)-(9) is satisfied with equality.

If none of the inequalities in (5)-(9) is satisfied with equality then it follows that the derivatives with respect to p of the equations (1)-(4) at \bar{p} constitute a set of independent vectors

since $\psi_{\bar{s},\omega} \not\propto \{0^n\}$. Moreover, $b(\bar{p}) = 0$. If one of the inequalities in (5)-(9) is satisfied with equality then, since the case $\bar{p} \neq v$ is considered, one of the inequalities in (5)-(8) is satisfied with equality, say the one corresponding to commodity $k \in I_{n+1}$. Define \tilde{s} by $\tilde{s}_j = \bar{s}_j$, $\forall j \in I_{n+1} \setminus \{k\}$, $\tilde{s}_k = -1$ if k corresponds to (5) or (7), and $\tilde{s}_k = +1$ if k corresponds to (6) or (8). Then $\psi_{\tilde{s},k} \not\propto \{0^{n+1}\}$ implies that the derivatives with respect to p of the binding inequality and (1)-(4) at \bar{p} constitute a set of independent vectors. Moreover, $b(\bar{p}) = 1$. Since (1)-(4) form n functions defined on \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} and (1)-(9) are C^2 functions, a 1-dimensional C^2 RCS is obtained. Since $\forall \bar{p} \in C_\omega(\bar{s})$, $b(\bar{p}) \leq 1$, it follows that $C_\omega(\bar{s})$ is a 1-dimensional C^2 manifold with boundary, where the boundary is given by the set of points $\bar{p} \in C_\omega(s)$ with $b(\bar{p}) = 1$, a 0-dimensional manifold.

The compactness of $C_\omega(\bar{s})$ follows immediately from the proof of Theorem 2.6. Consequently $C_\omega(\bar{s})$ is a compact C^2 1-dimensional manifold with boundary and therefore a finite union of disjoint sets being diffeomorphic to either the unit circle or the closed unit interval $[0, 1]$. Denote these sets by $C_\omega^1(\bar{s}), \dots, C_\omega^j(\bar{s})$. Notice that for every $j \in I_j(\bar{s})$, $\bar{p} \in C_\omega^j(\bar{s})$ is a point of the boundary of $C_\omega^j(\bar{s})$ if and only if $b(\bar{p}) = 1$.

2. C_ω is a finite union of arcs and loops for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$.

Let be given $p^0 \in C_\omega$. So for some $s^0 \in \mathcal{S}$ and for some $j^0 \in I_j(s^0)$, $p^0 \in C_\omega^{j^0}(s^0)$. Either $C_\omega^{j^0}(s^0)$ is a component of C_ω being diffeomorphic to the unit circle and has no boundary or $C_\omega^{j^0}(s^0)$ is a subset of C_ω being diffeomorphic to the unit interval and having two boundary points, p^1 and p^{-1} . Consider p^1 . Either $p^1 = v$, or exactly one of the inequalities in (5)-(8) is binding. Four cases have to be considered.

2.1. If $p^1 = v$ then since for every $j \in I_{n+1}$, $\psi_{j,\omega} \not\propto \{0\}$, $\exists s \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{s^0\}$ with $p^1 \in C_\omega(s)$.

2.2. If $k^0(s^0) = n - 1$ and the inequality in (5) is binding then by Walras' law p^1 is a Walrasian equilibrium price system. Suppose for some $s \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{s^0\}$, $p^1 \in C_\omega(s)$. Using $p^1 \neq v$ it follows that $I^0(s^0) \neq I^0(s)$ and that $(I^-(s^0) \cup I^-(s)) \cap (I^+(s^0) \cup I^+(s)) = \emptyset$. Let \bar{s} be the sign vector defined by $\bar{s}_j = 0$, $\forall j \in I^0(s^0) \cap I^0(s)$, $\bar{s}_j = -1$, $\forall j \in I^-(s^0) \cup I^-(s)$, $\bar{s}_j = +1$, $\forall j \in I^+(s^0) \cup I^+(s)$. Let k^1, k^2 be two different elements of $I^-(\bar{s}) \cup I^+(\bar{s})$. Then, since $k^0(\bar{s}) \leq n - 2$ and $p^1 \in D_\omega(\bar{s}, k^1, k^2)$, a contradiction with $\psi_{\bar{s},k^1,k^2} \not\propto \{0^{n+2}\}$ is obtained. Consequently, $\exists s \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{s^0\}$ such that $p^1 \in C_\omega(s)$.

2.3. If $k^0(s^0) = n - 1$ and an inequality in (7) or (8) is binding corresponding with some commodity $k \in I^0(s)$, then define s^1 by $s_j^1 = s_j^0$, $\forall j \in I_{n+1} \setminus \{k\}$, $s_k^1 = -1$ if an inequality in (7) is binding, and $s_k^1 = +1$ if an inequality in (8) is binding. Clearly p^1 is a boundary point of $C_\omega^{j^1}(s^1)$ for some $j^1 \in I_j(s^1)$. Moreover, $\exists s \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{s^0, s^1\}$ such that $p^1 \in C_\omega(s)$ since otherwise again a contradiction is obtained as before.

2.4. If $k^0(s^0) \leq n - 2$ then it can be shown in a similar way as in Case 2.3 that there is a unique $s^1 \in \mathcal{S}$ such that p^1 is a boundary point of $C_\omega^{j^1}(s^1)$ for some $j^1 \in I_j(s^1)$.

The set $C_\omega^{j^1}(s^1)$ obtained in the Cases 2.3 and 2.4 has two boundary points, p^1 and, say, p^2 . Using the same arguments as above either $p^2 = v$ or p^2 is a Walrasian equilibrium price

system or $p^2 \in C_\omega^{j^2}(s^2)$ for some unique $s^2 \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{s^1\}$ and $j^2 \in I_j(s^2)$. Repeating these arguments a number of sets $C^0 = C_\omega^{j^0}(s^0)$, $C^1 = C_\omega^{j^1}(s^1)$, $C^2 = C_\omega^{j^2}(s^2), \dots$ is obtained such that each set is a component of $C_\omega(s)$ for some $s \in \mathcal{S}$ being diffeomorphic to the unit interval, $C^j \cap C^{j+1}$ is a common boundary point and $C^j \neq C^{j+1}$. Therefore, after a finite number of k steps either a set C^k is obtained having v or a Walrasian equilibrium price system as a boundary point while C^0, \dots, C^k are all different, or $C^j = C^k$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $j < k$, and C^0, \dots, C^{k-1} are all different.

In the second case it will be shown that $j = 0$. Then it is easily verified that $C^0 \cup \dots \cup C^{k-1}$ is a component of C_ω containing p^0 being homeomorphic to the unit circle. Suppose $j > 1$ then $C^j \cap C^{k-1}$ is a boundary point of either C^{j-1} or C^{j+1} . Clearly $j+1 \leq k-1$. Suppose $j+1 = k-1$ then C^{j+1} has one boundary point in common with C^j and the other boundary point in common with $C^{j+2} = C^k = C^j$. The sets C^{j-1} , C^j , and C^{j+1} are different and share a common boundary point, giving a contradiction. Consequently $j+1 < k-1$. The three sets C^{j-1} , C^j , and C^{k-1} are different and the three sets C^j , C^{j+1} , and C^{k-1} are different, while the three sets in one of these two collections of sets have a common boundary point, giving a contradiction.

In the first case, consider the other boundary point of $C_\omega^{j^0}(s^0)$, denoted p^{-1} . Again, a number of sets C^0, C^{-1}, \dots is obtained such that after a finite number of k' steps, either a set $C^{-k'}$ is obtained having v or a Walrasian equilibrium price system as a boundary point, the sets $C^{-k'}, \dots, C^k$ are all different, and it is easily shown that the collection of sets $\bigcup_{j \in \{-k', \dots, k\}} C^j$ is the component of C_ω containing p^0 which is homeomorphic to the unit interval, or there is $j > -k'$ such that $C^{-k'} = C^j$, while the sets $C^{-k'+1}, \dots, C^k$ are all different. Suppose $j = k$ then since C^k has v or a Walrasian equilibrium price system as boundary point it holds that $C^{-k'+1} = C^{k-1}$, giving a contradiction unless $-k'+1 = k-1$. In the last case C^{k-1} has one boundary point in common with $C^{k-2} = C^{-k'} = C^k$ and the other boundary point in common with C^k . This implies that C^{k-1} and C^k have v or the same Walrasian equilibrium price system as a boundary point, a contradiction. Consequently $j < k$. Clearly $-k'+1 \leq j-1$. Suppose $-k'+1 = j-1$, then the three different sets $C^{-k'+1}$, C^j , and C^{j+1} have a common boundary point, giving a contradiction. Consequently $-k'+1 < j-1$. Hence $C^{-k'+1} \cap C^j$ is a boundary point of either C^{j-1} or C^{j+1} and therefore either $C^{-k'+1}, C^{j-1}, C^j$ are three different sets having a common boundary point, or $C^{-k'+1}, C^j, C^{j+1}$ are three different sets having a common boundary point, giving a contradiction.

Consequently C_ω has a finite number of components, being either arcs or loops. The boundary of C_ω is given by the collection consisting of the starting price system v and the Walrasian equilibrium price systems. Therefore the component containing v is an arc having a Walrasian equilibrium price system as the other boundary point. If there exists

another Walrasian equilibrium price system, say p^* , then the component containing p^* is an arc having p^* and a third Walrasian equilibrium price system as boundary points.

3. The closure of $\Omega \setminus \Omega^*$ in Ω has Lebesgue measure zero.

It has already been shown that $\Omega \setminus \Omega^*$ has Lebesgue measure zero. If $\omega \in \Omega \setminus \Omega^*$ then by Part 1 and Part 2 of the proof there exists $p \in S^n$ such that (p, ω) belongs to the set Σ , defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma = \{ & (p, \omega) \in S^n \times \Omega \mid \exists s \in \mathcal{S} \text{ such that } p \in C_\omega(s) \text{ and } \text{rank} \partial \psi_{s, \omega}(p) \leq n-1, \text{ or} \\ & \exists s \in \mathcal{S}, \exists k \in I^-(s) \cup I^+(s) \text{ such that } p \in C_\omega(s), \zeta_k(p, \omega) = 0, \text{ and } \text{rank} \partial \psi_{s, k, \omega}(p) \leq n, \text{ or} \\ & \exists s \in \mathcal{S}, k^0(s) \leq n-2, \exists k^1, k^2 \in I^-(s) \cup I^+(s), k^1 \neq k^2 \text{ such that} \\ & p \in C_\omega(s) \text{ and } \zeta_{k^1}(p, \omega) = \zeta_{k^2}(p, \omega) = 0, \text{ or } p = v \text{ and } \exists j \in I_{n+1} \text{ such that } \zeta_j(p, \omega) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easily shown that Σ is closed relative to $S^n \times \Omega$ since Σ can be obtained by finite unions and intersections of sets being closed in $S^n \times \Omega$, due to the continuity of the functions $\zeta, \partial \psi_s, \partial \psi_{s, k}$ and the continuity in p of $\min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j}{v_j}$ and $\max_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j}{v_j}$. Define the projection $\pi : \Sigma \rightarrow \Omega$ by $\pi(p, \omega) = \omega, \forall (p, \omega) \in \Sigma$. Then $\Omega \setminus \Omega^* \subset \pi(\Sigma)$ and $\pi(\Sigma)$ is a subset of a measure zero set by Lemmas 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4. It will be shown that $\pi(\Sigma)$ is closed in Ω . Since the image by a continuous proper mapping of a closed set is closed it is sufficient to show that π is proper. Let T be a compact subset of Ω . It has to be shown that $\pi^{-1}(T)$ is compact. Clearly $\pi^{-1}(T)$ is a closed set in Σ and therefore it is closed in $S^n \times \Omega$. Moreover, it is a subset of the set $\{(p, \omega) \in S^n \times T \mid p \in Q(\omega)\}$, which is compact by the compact-valuedness and upper semi-continuity of Q (Theorem 2.6). Consequently $\pi^{-1}(T)$ is compact. Q.E.D.

4 The Gross Substitution Case

In this section a starting price system $v \in S^n$ and a total excess demand function $z : \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ are given, with z satisfying the following assumptions.

- A3.** The function $z : \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ is continuous.
- A4.** For every $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}_{++}, \forall p \in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1}, z(\lambda p) = z(p)$.
- A5.** For every $p \in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1}, p \cdot z(p) = 0$.
- A6.** The function z is bounded from below, and if $(p^r)_{r \in \mathbf{N}}$ is a sequence in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} converging to an element $p \in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1} \setminus \{0^{n+1}\}$ with $p_k = 0$ for some $k \in I_{n+1}$, then $\sum_{j=1}^{n+1} |z_j(p^r)|$ goes to infinity.
- A7.** (Gross Substitutability, Finite Increment Form) If $\tilde{p}, \bar{p} \in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{n+1}$ are such that for some $k \in I_{n+1}, \tilde{p}_k < \bar{p}_k$, and $\forall j \in I_{n+1} \setminus \{k\}, \tilde{p}_j = \bar{p}_j$, then $\forall j \in I_{n+1} \setminus \{k\}, z_j(\tilde{p}) < z_j(\bar{p})$.

Due to the homogeneity of degree zero (A4) it is possible to normalize the set of prices to the set S^n on which the adjustment process is defined. For $\tilde{p}, \bar{p} \in S^n$ define the sets $J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) = \{k \in I_{n+1} \mid \frac{\bar{p}_k}{p_k} = \max_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\bar{p}_j}{p_j}\}$ and $J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) = \{k \in I_{n+1} \mid \frac{\bar{p}_k}{p_k} = \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\bar{p}_j}{p_j}\}$. Clearly, $J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \neq \emptyset$ and $J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, if $\tilde{p} \neq \bar{p}$ then $k \in J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p})$ implies $\frac{\bar{p}_k}{p_k} > 1$, and $k \in J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p})$ implies $\frac{\bar{p}_k}{p_k} < 1$. The following lemma will appear to be very useful.

Lemma 4.1 *Let be given a total excess demand function z satisfying Assumptions A4 and A7 and $\tilde{p}, \bar{p} \in S^n$ with $\tilde{p} \neq \bar{p}$. Then $k \in J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p})$ implies $z_k(\tilde{p}) > z_k(\bar{p})$ and $k \in J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p})$ implies $z_k(\tilde{p}) < z_k(\bar{p})$.*

Proof Let $k \in J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p})$ and define $\hat{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^{n+1}$ by $\hat{p} = \frac{\bar{p}_k}{p_k} \tilde{p}$. By Assumption A4 $z(\hat{p}) = z(\tilde{p})$. Clearly $\hat{p}_k = \bar{p}_k$, $\forall j \in I_{n+1}$, $\hat{p}_j \geq \bar{p}_j$, and $\exists j \in I_{n+1}$, $\hat{p}_j > \bar{p}_j$. Given \hat{p} , decrease the prices for commodities $j \in I_{n+1} \setminus \{k\}$ until \bar{p} is reached. Using Assumption A7 repeatedly yields $z_k(\bar{p}) < z_k(\hat{p}) = z_k(\tilde{p})$. The case with $k \in J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p})$ can be treated similarly. Q.E.D.

Using Lemma 4.1 it is trivial to show that in the Gross Substitution case a Walrasian equilibrium, if it exists, is unique.

Define for every $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ the set S_λ^n by $S_\lambda^n = \{p \in S^n \mid \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j}{v_j} = \lambda\}$. Clearly, $S_1^n = \{v\}$. In case $n = 2$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ the set S_λ^n consists of the sides of a triangle. For arbitrary $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that for $\lambda^1, \lambda^2 \in (0, 1]$ with $\lambda^1 \neq \lambda^2$ the sets $S_{\lambda^1}^n$ and $S_{\lambda^2}^n$ are disjoint, and that $\bigcup_{\lambda \in (0, 1]} S_\lambda^n = S^n$. The first step in proving that under Assumptions A3-A7 the price adjustment process converges is to show that if the adjustment process has reached the set S_λ^n and did not find a Walrasian equilibrium price system then the adjustment process intersects the set $S_{\lambda-\delta}^n$ for every δ small enough.

Lemma 4.2 *Let be given a total excess demand function z satisfying Assumptions A3-A5 and A7, and let $v \in S^n$ be a starting price system. If for some $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ and for some $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $\bar{p} \in C(s) \cap S_\lambda^n$ and $z(\bar{p}) \neq 0^{n+1}$, then $\exists \bar{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, $\exists \varepsilon > 0$, such that $\forall \delta \in [0, \varepsilon]$, $C(\bar{s}) \cap S_{\lambda-\delta}^n \neq \emptyset$. If $\forall j \in I^+(s)$, $z_j(\bar{p}) > 0$, and $\forall j \in I^-(s)$, $z_j(\bar{p}) < 0$, then \bar{s} can be taken equal to s .*

Proof Let \bar{s} be such that $\bar{s}_j = +1$ if $z_j(\bar{p}) > 0$, $\bar{s}_j = 0$ if $z_j(\bar{p}) = 0$, and $\bar{s}_j = -1$ if $z_j(\bar{p}) < 0$. Notice that $\bar{s} = s$ if the requirements in the last part of Lemma 4.2 are satisfied. Since $z(\bar{p}) \neq 0^{n+1}$ it holds by Walras' law that $\bar{s} \in \mathcal{S}$. Clearly $\bar{p} \in C(\bar{s}) \cap S_\lambda^n$. If for every $j \in I_{n+1}$ $z_j(\bar{p}) \neq 0$ then Lemma 4.2 is clearly true by the continuity of z . So consider the case where $I^0(\bar{s}) \neq \emptyset$. For $\delta \in [0, \lambda)$ define the set $E(\bar{p}, \bar{s}, \delta) = \{p \in S^n \mid \forall k \in I^-(\bar{s}), \frac{p_k}{\bar{p}_k} = 1 - \frac{\delta}{\lambda}, \forall k \in I^0(\bar{s}), 1 - \frac{\delta}{\lambda} \leq \frac{p_k}{\bar{p}_k} \leq \max_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\bar{p}_j}{p_j}, \forall k \in I^+(\bar{s}), \frac{p_k}{\bar{p}_k} = \max_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\bar{p}_j}{p_j}\}$. It is easily verified that $E(\bar{p}, \bar{s}, \delta)$ is a compact subset of $A(\bar{s}) \cap S_{\lambda-\delta}^n$. By continuity of the total excess demand function z there exists $\varepsilon \in (0, \lambda)$ such that if $0 \leq \delta \leq \varepsilon$ then for every $p \in E(\bar{p}, \bar{s}, \delta)$, $z_j(p) > 0$

if $j \in I^+(\bar{s})$ and $z_j(p) < 0$ if $j \in I^-(\bar{s})$. For $\delta = 0$ Lemma 4.2 is obviously true. Consider an arbitrary $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon]$. Consider $p^* \in \arg \min_{p \in E(\bar{p}, \bar{s}, \delta)} (\max_{j \in I^0(\bar{s})} |z_j(p)|)$.

Suppose $\max_{j \in I^0(\bar{s})} |z_j(p^*)| > 0$. Define the sets $I_-^0 = \{k \in I^0(\bar{s}) \mid z_k(p^*) = -\max_{j \in I^0(\bar{s})} |z_j(p^*)|\}$ and $I_+^0 = \{k \in I^0(\bar{s}) \mid z_k(p^*) = \max_{j \in I^0(\bar{s})} |z_j(p^*)|\}$. Suppose $k \in I_-^0$ and $\frac{p_k^*}{\bar{p}_k} = 1 - \frac{\delta}{\lambda}$. By Lemma 4.1 and since $p^* \in E(\bar{p}, \bar{s}, \delta)$ this implies $0 = z_k(\bar{p}) < z_k(p^*)$, a contradiction since $k \in I_-^0$. Hence, $k \in I_-^0$ implies $\frac{p_k^*}{\bar{p}_k} > 1 - \frac{\delta}{\lambda}$. Similarly it can be shown that $k \in I_+^0$ implies $\frac{p_k^*}{\bar{p}_k} < \max_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j^*}{\bar{p}_j}$. Next three possible cases will be considered, each leading to a contradiction with the supposition that $\max_{j \in I^0(\bar{s})} |z_j(p^*)| > 0$. Therefore $\max_{j \in I^0(\bar{s})} |z_j(p^*)| = 0$, and this result together with the choice of ε implies $p^* \in B(\bar{s})$. Moreover, $p^* \in E(\bar{p}, \bar{s}, \delta) \subset A(\bar{s}) \cap S_{\lambda-\delta}^n$, and therefore $p^* \in C(\bar{s}) \cap S_{\lambda-\delta}^n$.

1. If $I_-^0 \neq \emptyset$ and $I_+^0 = \emptyset$ then, for $\alpha > 0$, define p^α by $p_k^\alpha = p_k^*$, $\forall k \in I^-(\bar{s}) \cup (I^0(\bar{s}) \setminus I_-^0)$, $p_k^\alpha = (1 - \alpha)p_k^*$, $\forall k \in I_-^0$, $p_k^\alpha = (1 + \frac{\alpha \sum_{j \in I_-^0} p_j^*}{\sum_{j \in I^+(\bar{s})} p_j^*})p_k^*$, $\forall k \in I^+(\bar{s})$. Since $k \in I_-^0$ implies $\frac{p_k^*}{\bar{p}_k} > 1 - \frac{\delta}{\lambda}$, α can be chosen small enough to guarantee that $p^\alpha \in E(\bar{p}, \bar{s}, \delta)$, $|z_k(p^\alpha)| < \max_{j \in I^0(\bar{s})} |z_j(p^*)|$, $\forall k \in I^0(\bar{s}) \setminus I_-^0$, and $z_k(p^\alpha) < 0$, $\forall k \in I_-^0$. By Lemma 4.1 it now holds that $\max_{j \in I^0(\bar{s})} |z_j(p^\alpha)| < \max_{j \in I^0(\bar{s})} |z_j(p^*)|$, a contradiction with the definition of p^* .

2. If $I_-^0 = \emptyset$ and $I_+^0 \neq \emptyset$ then define the, possibly empty, set $K = \{k \in I^0(\bar{s}) \mid \frac{p_k^*}{\bar{p}_k} = \max_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j^*}{\bar{p}_j}\}$. Moreover, for $\alpha > 0$, define p^α by $p_k^\alpha = p_k^*$, $\forall k \in I^-(\bar{s}) \cup (I^0(\bar{s}) \setminus (I_+^0 \cup K))$, $p_k^\alpha = (1 + \alpha)p_k^*$, $\forall k \in I_+^0$, $p_k^\alpha = (1 - \frac{\alpha \sum_{j \in I_+^0} p_j^*}{\sum_{j \in I^+(\bar{s}) \cup K} p_j^*})p_k^*$, $\forall k \in I^+(\bar{s}) \cup K$. Since $k \in I_+^0$ implies $\frac{p_k^*}{\bar{p}_k} < \max_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j^*}{\bar{p}_j}$, α can be chosen small enough to guarantee that $p^\alpha \in E(\bar{p}, \bar{s}, \delta)$, $|z_k(p^\alpha)| < \max_{j \in I^0(\bar{s})} |z_j(p^*)|$, $\forall k \in I^0(\bar{s}) \setminus I_+^0$, and $z_k(p^\alpha) > 0$, $\forall k \in I_+^0$. By Lemma 4.1 and the construction of p^α , $\max_{j \in I^0(\bar{s})} |z_j(p^\alpha)| < \max_{j \in I^0(\bar{s})} |z_j(p^*)|$, a contradiction with the definition of p^* .

3. If $I_-^0 \neq \emptyset$ and $I_+^0 \neq \emptyset$ then, for $\alpha > 0$, define p^α by $p_k^\alpha = p_k^*$, $\forall k \in I_{n+1} \setminus (I_-^0 \cup I_+^0)$, $p_k^\alpha = (1 - \alpha)p_k^*$, $\forall k \in I_-^0$, $p_k^\alpha = (1 + \frac{\alpha \sum_{j \in I_-^0} p_j^*}{\sum_{j \in I_+^0} p_j^*})p_k^*$, $\forall k \in I_+^0$. Clearly, α can be chosen small enough to guarantee that $p^\alpha \in E(\bar{p}, \bar{s}, \delta)$ and $|z_k(p^\alpha)| < \max_{j \in I^0(\bar{s})} |z_j(p^*)|$, $\forall k \in I^0(\bar{s}) \setminus (I_-^0 \cup I_+^0)$, $z_k(p^\alpha) < 0$, $\forall k \in I_-^0$, and $z_k(p^\alpha) > 0$, $\forall k \in I_+^0$. By Lemma 4.1 a contradiction is obtained as before. Q.E.D.

The next step is to show that if \tilde{s} and \bar{s} in \mathcal{S} are such that $k^0(\tilde{s}) = k^0(\bar{s})$ and $\tilde{p} \in C(\tilde{s})$ then there is no $\bar{p} \in C(\bar{s}) \setminus C(\tilde{s})$. This is the result of Lemma 4.4. So, if during the price adjustment process the region $A(\tilde{s})$ is reached, and therefore $k^0(\tilde{s})$ markets are in equilibrium, then every price system \bar{p} ever generated by the process with $k^0(\tilde{s})$ markets in equilibrium satisfies $\bar{p} \in A(\tilde{s})$. Moreover, it is shown in Lemma 4.4 that if two price systems \tilde{p}, \bar{p} are reached by the adjustment process with the same number of markets in equilibrium and with the minimal price ratio (with respect to the starting price system

v) of \tilde{p} greater than that of \bar{p} then $\tilde{p}, \bar{p} \in C(s)$ for a uniquely determined sign vector s . Moreover, $I^-(s) = J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p})$ and $I^+(s) = J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p})$. So the prices of commodities in excess supply (demand) have been decreased (increased) maximally. In order to show Lemma 4.4, the technical Lemma 4.3 has to be shown first.

Lemma 4.3 *Let be given a starting price system $v \in S^n$. Moreover, let be given $\tilde{s}, \bar{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\tilde{s} \neq \bar{s}$, $k^0(\tilde{s}) = k^0(\bar{s})$, $\tilde{p} \in A(\tilde{s})$, and $\bar{p} \in A(\bar{s})$, with $\tilde{p} \neq \bar{p}$. Then*

$$J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \cap (I^-(\tilde{s}) \cup I^0(\tilde{s})) \cap (I^0(\bar{s}) \cup I^+(\bar{s})) \neq \emptyset \text{ or}$$

$$J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \cap (I^0(\tilde{s}) \cup I^+(\tilde{s})) \cap (I^-(\bar{s}) \cup I^0(\bar{s})) \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof Suppose, on the contrary, that

$$J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \subset I^+(\tilde{s}) \cup I^-(\bar{s}) \text{ and} \quad (13)$$

$$J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \subset I^-(\tilde{s}) \cup I^+(\bar{s}). \quad (14)$$

It will be shown that if (13) and (14) hold then

$$J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \cap I^+(\tilde{s}) = \emptyset \text{ or } J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \cap I^+(\bar{s}) = \emptyset, \quad (15)$$

$$J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \cap I^+(\tilde{s}) = \emptyset \text{ or } J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \cap I^-(\tilde{s}) = \emptyset, \quad (16)$$

$$J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \cap I^-(\bar{s}) = \emptyset \text{ or } J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \cap I^-(\tilde{s}) = \emptyset, \quad (17)$$

$$J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \cap I^-(\bar{s}) = \emptyset \text{ or } J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \cap I^+(\bar{s}) = \emptyset. \quad (18)$$

From (14)-(16) it follows that $J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \cap I^+(\bar{s}) = \emptyset$, and from (14), (17), and (18) it follows that $J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \cap I^-(\bar{s}) = \emptyset$. Together with (13) this yields $J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) = \emptyset$, a contradiction, and this proves the lemma. It remains to be shown that (13) and (14) imply (15)-(18). Let $j^1 \in J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p})$ and $j^2 \in J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p})$.

Suppose $j^1 \in I^+(\tilde{s})$. If $j^2 \in I^+(\bar{s})$ then $1 > \frac{\bar{p}_{j^2}}{p_{j^2}} = \frac{\bar{p}_{j^2}}{v_{j^2}} \frac{v_{j^2}}{p_{j^2}} \geq \frac{\bar{p}_{j^1}}{v_{j^1}} \frac{v_{j^1}}{p_{j^1}} = \frac{\bar{p}_{j^1}}{p_{j^1}} > 1$, a contradiction. Hence (15) is true. If $j^2 \in I^-(\bar{s})$ then for every $k \in I^-(\bar{s})$ it holds that $\frac{\bar{p}_k}{p_k} \leq \frac{\bar{p}_{j^2}}{p_{j^2}}$, so $k \in J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p})$, and by (14) $k \in I^-(\tilde{s})$. For every $k \in I^+(\bar{s})$ it holds that $\frac{\bar{p}_k}{p_k} \geq \frac{\bar{p}_{j^1}}{p_{j^1}}$, so $k \in J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p})$, and by (13) $k \in I^+(\tilde{s})$. Consequently $I^+(\bar{s}) \subset I^+(\tilde{s})$ and $I^-(\bar{s}) \subset I^-(\tilde{s})$. Since $\tilde{s} \neq \bar{s}$ and $k^0(\tilde{s}) = k^0(\bar{s})$ a contradiction is obtained. Hence (16) is true.

Suppose $j^1 \in I^-(\tilde{s})$. If $j^2 \in I^-(\tilde{s})$ then $1 > \frac{\bar{p}_{j^2}}{p_{j^2}} \geq \frac{\bar{p}_{j^1}}{p_{j^1}} > 1$, a contradiction. Hence (17) is true. If $j^2 \in I^+(\bar{s})$ then for every $k \in I^+(\bar{s})$ it holds that $\frac{\bar{p}_k}{p_k} \leq \frac{\bar{p}_{j^2}}{p_{j^2}}$, so $k \in J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p})$, and by (14) $k \in I^-(\tilde{s})$. For every $k \in I^-(\tilde{s})$ it holds that $\frac{\bar{p}_k}{p_k} \geq \frac{\bar{p}_{j^1}}{p_{j^1}}$, so $k \in J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p})$, and by (13) $k \in I^-(\bar{s})$. Since $\tilde{s} \neq \bar{s}$ and $k^0(\tilde{s}) = k^0(\bar{s})$ a contradiction is obtained. So (18) is true. Q.E.D.

Lemma 4.4 *Let be given a total excess demand function z satisfying Assumptions A4 and A7, a starting price system $v \in S^n$, and sign vectors $\tilde{s}, \bar{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ with $k^0(\tilde{s}) = k^0(\bar{s})$. If $C(\tilde{s}) \neq \emptyset$ then $C(\tilde{s}) \setminus C(\bar{s}) = \emptyset$. Moreover, if there are price systems $\tilde{p} \in C(\tilde{s})$ and $\bar{p} \in C(\bar{s})$ with $\min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\tilde{p}_j}{v_j} > \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\bar{p}_j}{v_j}$ then $\tilde{s} = \bar{s}$, $J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) = I^-(\tilde{s})$, and $J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) = I^+(\tilde{s})$.*

Proof Suppose, on the contrary, that there exists $\tilde{p} \in C(\tilde{s})$ and $\bar{p} \in C(\bar{s}) \setminus C(\tilde{s})$. Clearly, $\tilde{s} \neq \bar{s}$. Moreover, $\tilde{p} \in A(\tilde{s})$ and $\bar{p} \in A(\bar{s})$ and therefore by Lemma 4.3 there exists a $k \in J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \cap (I^-(\tilde{s}) \cup I^0(\tilde{s})) \cap (I^0(\bar{s}) \cup I^+(\bar{s}))$ or there exists a $k \in J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \cap (I^0(\tilde{s}) \cup I^+(\tilde{s})) \cap (I^-(\bar{s}) \cup I^0(\bar{s}))$. In the first case by Lemma 4.1 $z_k(\tilde{p}) > z_k(\bar{p})$. However, $z_k(\tilde{p}) \leq 0$ and $z_k(\bar{p}) \geq 0$, a contradiction. In the second case by Lemma 4.1 $z_k(\tilde{p}) < z_k(\bar{p})$. However, $z_k(\tilde{p}) \geq 0$ and $z_k(\bar{p}) \leq 0$, a contradiction. This proves the first part of Lemma 4.4.

If $\tilde{p} \in C(\tilde{s})$ and $\bar{p} \in C(\bar{s})$ then by the first part of the lemma it holds that $C(\tilde{s}) = C(\bar{s})$. If $j \in I^-(\tilde{s})$ then $\frac{\tilde{p}_j}{v_j} = \frac{\bar{p}_j}{v_j} < \frac{\tilde{p}_j}{v_j} \frac{v_j}{p_j} = 1$ and therefore $J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \subset I^0(\bar{s}) \cup I^+(\bar{s})$. Suppose $j \in J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \cap I^0(\bar{s})$. Then by Lemma 4.1 and since $\tilde{p}, \bar{p} \in C(\bar{s})$, $0 = z_j(\tilde{p}) > z_j(\bar{p}) = 0$, a contradiction. Consequently $J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \subset I^+(\bar{s})$. If $j, j' \in I^+(\bar{s})$ then $\frac{\tilde{p}_j}{v_j} = \frac{\bar{p}_{j'}}{v_{j'}}$. Hence $J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) = I^+(\bar{s})$ and $J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \subset I^-(\bar{s}) \cup I^0(\bar{s})$. Suppose $j \in J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \cap I^0(\bar{s})$. Then $0 = z_j(\tilde{p}) < z_j(\bar{p}) = 0$, a contradiction. It follows that $J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) = I^-(\bar{s})$. In a similar way it can be shown that $J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) = I^-(\tilde{s})$ and $J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) = I^+(\tilde{s})$, hence $I^-(\tilde{s}) = I^-(\bar{s})$, $I^+(\tilde{s}) = I^+(\bar{s})$, and therefore $\tilde{s} = \bar{s}$. Q.E.D.

The next step in proving the convergence of the price adjustment process is showing that the adjustment process intersects each set S_λ^n at most once. First it is shown that given $s \in \mathcal{S}$ the intersection of $C(s)$ and S_λ^n contains at most one element.

Lemma 4.5 *Let be given a total excess demand function z satisfying Assumptions A4 and A7, and let $v \in S^n$ be a starting price system. Then for every $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ and for every $s \in \mathcal{S}$ the set $C(s) \cap S_\lambda^n$ contains at most one element.*

Proof Suppose $\tilde{p}, \bar{p} \in C(s) \cap S_\lambda^n$ with $\tilde{p} \neq \bar{p}$. Then $\forall j \in I^-(s)$, $\frac{\tilde{p}_j}{v_j} = \frac{\lambda v_j}{\lambda v_j} = 1$. So $\tilde{p} \neq \bar{p}$ implies that there exists a $j^1 \in J_{\max}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \cap (I^0(s) \cup I^+(s))$ and there exists a $j^2 \in J_{\min}(\tilde{p}, \bar{p}) \cap (I^0(s) \cup I^+(s))$. By Lemma 4.1 $z_{j^1}(\tilde{p}) > z_{j^1}(\bar{p})$ and $z_{j^2}(\tilde{p}) < z_{j^2}(\bar{p})$. So $j^1, j^2 \notin I^0(s)$. If $j^1, j^2 \in I^+(s)$ then $1 < \frac{\tilde{p}_{j^1}}{v_{j^1}} = \frac{\bar{p}_{j^2}}{v_{j^2}} < 1$, a contradiction. Consequently $C(s) \cap S_\lambda^n$ contains at most one element. Q.E.D.

After these preliminary lemmas it is possible to show the convergence of the price adjustment process. First it will be shown that the price adjustment process intersects each set S_λ^n at most once for every $\lambda \in (0, 1]$. Secondly the continuity of the price adjustment process will be shown.

Theorem 4.6 *Let be given a total excess demand function z satisfying Assumptions A3-A7 and let $v \in S^n$ be a starting price system. If v is not a Walrasian equilibrium price system then the set C is an arc containing v and a Walrasian equilibrium price system as boundary points.*

Proof Define the (possibly empty valued) correspondence $\Pi : (0, 1] \rightarrow S^n$ by $\Pi(\lambda) = C \cap S_\lambda^n$. First it is shown that there exists a $\lambda^* \in (0, 1]$ such that Π is a function on a compact set $[\lambda^*, 1]$ and is empty valued on the set $(0, \lambda^*)$. In a similar way as in the proof of Theorem 2.6 it can be shown that for every $s \in \mathcal{S}$ the set $C(s)$ is compact and therefore that the set $C = \bigcup_{s \in \mathcal{S}} C(s)$ is compact. Define $\lambda^* = \min_{p \in C} (\min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j}{v_j})$. Obviously it holds that $\Pi(\lambda) = \emptyset$ if $\lambda < \lambda^*$. Moreover, by Lemma 4.2 $\Pi(\lambda^*)$ is a Walrasian equilibrium price system. By the compactness of C , Lemma 4.2, the uniqueness of the Walrasian equilibrium price system, and since $v \in \Pi(1)$, it follows that $\Pi(\lambda) \neq \emptyset$, $\forall \lambda \in [\lambda^*, 1]$.

Now let be given some $\lambda \in [\lambda^*, 1]$ and suppose $\tilde{p} \in C(\tilde{s})$, $\bar{p} \in C(\bar{s})$, $\tilde{p} \neq \bar{p}$, and $\tilde{p}, \bar{p} \in S_\lambda^n$. By Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5 $k^0(\tilde{s}) \neq k^0(\bar{s})$. Assume without loss of generality that $k^0(\tilde{s}) < k^0(\bar{s})$. Since $C(\tilde{s})$ is compact there is a price system p^1 such that $p^1 \in \arg \min_{p \in C(\tilde{s})} (\min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j}{v_j})$. By Lemma 4.2 it follows that for some $k \in I^-(\tilde{s}) \cup I^+(\tilde{s})$, $z_k(p^1) = 0$. Hence $p^1 \in C(s^1)$, where s^1 is defined by $s_k^1 = 0$, and $s_j^1 = \tilde{s}_j$, $\forall j \in I_{n+1} \setminus \{k\}$. Since $k^0(\tilde{s}) < k^0(\bar{s}) \leq n-1$ and by Walras' law, k can be chosen such that $s^1 \in \mathcal{S}$. Repeating this argument a finite number of times, a price system $\hat{p} \in C(\hat{s})$ is found, where $\hat{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, $k^0(\hat{s}) = k^0(\bar{s})$, and for some $k \in I^0(\hat{s})$ it holds that $\frac{\hat{p}_k}{v_k} = \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\hat{p}_j}{v_j}$ or $\frac{\hat{p}_k}{v_k} = \max_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\hat{p}_j}{v_j}$. Suppose $\min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\hat{p}_j}{v_j} = \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\bar{p}_j}{v_j}$ then $\tilde{p}, \bar{p} \in S_\lambda^n$ implies $\min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\hat{p}_j}{v_j} = \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\tilde{p}_j}{v_j}$. Using Lemma 4.5 yields that the minimizing argument equals \tilde{p} in every step, hence $\hat{p} = \tilde{p}$. By Lemma 4.5 $\tilde{p} \notin C(\bar{s})$, and since $\tilde{p} \in C(\hat{s})$ a contradiction with Lemma 4.4 is obtained. Consequently $\min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\hat{p}_j}{v_j} < \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\bar{p}_j}{v_j}$. By Lemma 4.4 $\bar{s} = \hat{s}$, $J_{\min}(\bar{p}, \hat{p}) = I^-(\hat{s})$, and $J_{\max}(\bar{p}, \hat{p}) = I^+(\hat{s})$. Consider the case where $\frac{\hat{p}_k}{v_k} = \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\hat{p}_j}{v_j}$. Let $k' \in J_{\min}(\bar{p}, \hat{p})$. Since $\frac{\hat{p}_k}{v_k} = \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\hat{p}_j}{v_j}$ and $J_{\min}(\bar{p}, \hat{p}) = I^-(\hat{s}) = I^-(\bar{s})$ it holds that $\frac{\hat{p}_k}{v_k} \leq \frac{\bar{p}_{k'}}{v_{k'}}$. So $k \in J_{\min}(\bar{p}, \hat{p})$, a contradiction with $k \in I^0(\hat{s})$. Similarly a contradiction is obtained if $\frac{\hat{p}_k}{v_k} = \max_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\hat{p}_j}{v_j}$. This shows that for $\lambda \in [\lambda^*, 1]$, $\Pi(\lambda)$ is single-valued.

Either $\lambda^* = 1$ and $C = \{v\}$, or $\lambda^* < 1$. In the latter case define the function $\pi : [0, 1] \rightarrow C$ by $\{\pi(t)\} = \Pi((\lambda^* - 1)t + 1)$, $\forall t \in [0, 1]$. The function π is one-one and onto. It remains to be shown that π is continuous. The continuity of π^{-1} follows then immediately using the compactness of $[0, 1]$. Let $(t^r)_{r \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $[0, 1]$ with limit \bar{t} . Consider the sequence $(\pi(t^r))_{r \in \mathbb{N}}$. If π is not continuous, then by the compactness of C there is no loss of generality in assuming that $\pi(t^r)$ converges to a limit $\bar{p} \in C$ and $\bar{p} \neq \pi(\bar{t})$. Since $\pi(t^r) \in S_{(\lambda^*-1)t^r+1}^n$ it holds that $\min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\bar{p}_j}{v_j} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\pi_j(t^r)}{v_j} = (\lambda^* - 1)\bar{t} + 1$. Hence $\{\bar{p}, \pi(\bar{t})\} \subset C \cap S_{(\lambda^*-1)\bar{t}+1}^n = \{\pi(\bar{t})\}$, a contradiction. Q.E.D.

In the Gross Substitution case the adjustment process has very interesting economic properties as will be made clear in the three final theorems. In Theorem 4.7 it is shown that during the adjustment process the number of markets in equilibrium is increasing. More precisely, if a market attains an equilibrium situation, it remains in equilibrium during the rest of the adjustment process. In Theorem 4.8 this result is even strengthened and it is shown that on every market the absolute value of the excess demand is monotonically decreasing. In Theorem 4.9 it is shown that during the entire process, prices of commodities in excess demand are strictly increasing, while prices of commodities in excess supply are strictly decreasing. Theorem 4.9 makes clear that the prices on markets out of equilibrium are adjusted in a way which is qualitatively the same as Walrasian tatonnement, while Theorem 4.7 states an important difference; markets in equilibrium remain in equilibrium. Let p^* be the unique Walrasian equilibrium for an economy with a demand function satisfying gross substitutability. Define $\lambda^* = \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j^*}{v_j}$ and define the function $\pi : [0, 1] \rightarrow S^n$ by $\{\pi(t)\} = C \cap S_{(\lambda^* - 1)t + 1}^n$. In the proof of Theorem 4.7 it is shown that π is a homeomorphism between C and $[0, 1]$ if $\lambda^* < 1$. Moreover, $\pi(0) = v$ and $\pi(1) = p^*$. If $\lambda^* = 1$, then this function is still well-defined and is a constant function, assigning to every $t \in [0, 1]$ the Walrasian equilibrium price system v .

Theorem 4.7 *Let be given a total excess demand function z satisfying Assumptions A3-A7 and let $v \in S^n$ be a starting price system. Take $t^1, t^2 \in [0, 1]$ with $t^1 < t^2$. If $s^1, s^2 \in S$ are such that $\pi(t^1) \in C(s^1)$ and $\pi(t^2) \in C(s^2)$ and if $\lambda^* \neq 1$ then $I^-(s^1) \supset I^-(s^2)$, $I^0(s^1) \subset I^0(s^2)$, and $I^+(s^1) \supset I^+(s^2)$.*

Proof Let $p^1 = \pi(t^1)$ and $p^2 = \pi(t^2)$. Notice that $\min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j^1}{v_j} > \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j^2}{v_j}$, since $\lambda^* \neq 1$. Suppose $k \in (I^0(s^1) \setminus I^0(s^2)) \cup (I^-(s^2) \setminus I^-(s^1)) \cup (I^+(s^2) \setminus I^+(s^1))$.

If $k^0(s^1) = k^0(s^2)$ then by Lemma 4.4 it holds that $s^1 = s^2$, giving a contradiction with the choice of k .

If $k^0(s^1) > k^0(s^2)$ then by the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 4.6, starting with $C(s^2)$, there exists an $\hat{s} \in S$ and a $\hat{p} \in C(\hat{s})$, such that $k^0(\hat{s}) = k^0(s^1)$, $\min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\hat{p}_j}{v_j} \leq \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j^2}{v_j}$, $\exists k' \in I^0(\hat{s})$, $\frac{\hat{p}_{k'}}{v_{k'}} = \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\hat{p}_j}{v_j}$ or $\frac{\hat{p}_{k'}}{v_{k'}} = \max_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\hat{p}_j}{v_j}$. Since $\min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\hat{p}_j}{v_j} < \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j^1}{v_j}$ it holds by Lemma 4.4 that $s^1 = \hat{s}$, $J_{\min}(p^1, \hat{p}) = I^-(\hat{s})$, and $J_{\max}(p^1, \hat{p}) = I^+(\hat{s})$. Consider the case where $\frac{\hat{p}_{k'}}{v_{k'}} = \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\hat{p}_j}{v_j}$. Let $j' \in J_{\min}(p^1, \hat{p})$. Since $p^1 \in C(\hat{s})$ and $J_{\min}(p^1, \hat{p}) = I^-(\hat{s})$, $\frac{\hat{p}_{k'}}{v_{k'}} \leq \frac{\hat{p}_{j'}}{v_{j'}}$. So $k' \in J_{\min}(p^1, \hat{p})$, a contradiction with $k' \in I^0(\hat{s})$. Similarly a contradiction is obtained if $\frac{\hat{p}_{k'}}{v_{k'}} = \max_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\hat{p}_j}{v_j}$.

If $k^0(s^1) < k^0(s^2)$ then again the construction of the proof of Theorem 4.6 can be used, starting with $C(s^1)$. There exists an $\hat{s} \in S$ and a $\hat{p} \in C(\hat{s})$ such that $k^0(\hat{s}) = k^0(s^2)$, $\min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\hat{p}_j}{v_j} \leq \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j^1}{v_j}$, $\exists k' \in I^0(\hat{s})$, $\frac{\hat{p}_{k'}}{v_{k'}} = \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\hat{p}_j}{v_j}$ or $\frac{\hat{p}_{k'}}{v_{k'}} = \max_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\hat{p}_j}{v_j}$. Moreover, $I^-(s^1) \supset$

$I^-(\hat{s})$, $I^0(s^1) \subset I^0(\hat{s})$, and $I^+(s^1) \supset I^+(\hat{s})$. If $\min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\hat{p}_j}{v_j} \neq \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j^2}{v_j}$ then, using Lemma 4.4, $\hat{s} = s^2$, giving a contradiction with the existence of k . So consider the case where $\min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{\hat{p}_j}{v_j} = \min_{j \in I_{n+1}} \frac{p_j^2}{v_j}$. Now $\hat{p} = p^2$ since $C \cap S_{(\lambda^*-1)t^2+1}^n$ contains a unique element. If $j \in I^-(\hat{s})$ then $\frac{\hat{p}_j}{p_j^2} < 1$. Hence $J_{\max}(p^1, \hat{p}) \subset I^0(\hat{s}) \cup I^+(\hat{s})$. If $j \in J_{\max}(p^1, \hat{p}) \cap I^0(\hat{s})$ then by Lemma 4.1 $z_j(p^1) > z_j(\hat{p}) = 0$, therefore $j \in I^+(s^1)$, and hence $\frac{\hat{p}_j}{p_j^2} \leq \frac{\hat{p}_{j'}}{p_{j'}^2}$ with $j' \in I^+(\hat{s})$. Since $I^+(\hat{s}) \subset I^+(s^1)$ it follows that $\frac{\hat{p}_j}{p_j^2} = \frac{\hat{p}_{j'}}{p_{j'}^2}$ if $j, j' \in I^+(\hat{s})$. Consequently $I^+(\hat{s}) \subset J_{\max}(p^1, \hat{p})$. It follows in a similar way that $I^-(\hat{s}) \subset J_{\min}(p^1, \hat{p})$. Consider k defined in the beginning of the proof. If $k \in I^-(s^2) \setminus I^-(s^1)$ then $z_k(\hat{p}) \leq 0$ since $\hat{p} = p^2$. Let $j \in I^-(\hat{s})$ then $j \in I^-(s^1)$, and using $k \in I^-(s^2)$ and $\hat{p} = p^2$ it holds that $\frac{\hat{p}_k}{p_k^2} \leq \frac{\hat{p}_j}{p_j^2}$. Consequently $k \in J_{\min}(p^1, \hat{p})$. By Lemma 4.1 it holds that $0 \leq z_k(p^1) < z_k(\hat{p}) \leq 0$, a contradiction. The case where $k \in I^+(s^2) \setminus I^+(s^1)$ yields a contradiction in a similar way. Finally, consider the case where $k \in I^0(s^1) \setminus I^0(s^2)$. Hence $k \in I^-(s^2) \cup I^+(s^2)$ and it can be shown that $k \in J_{\min}(p^1, \hat{p}) \cup J_{\max}(p^1, \hat{p})$. Since $k \in I^0(s^1) \subset I^0(\hat{s})$, $0 = z_k(p^1) = z_k(\hat{p})$. By Lemma 4.1 it holds that $z_k(\hat{p}) \neq 0$, a contradiction. Q.E.D.

Theorem 4.8 *Let be given a total excess demand function z satisfying Assumptions A3-A7 and let $v \in S^n$ be a starting price system. Take $t^1, t^2 \in [0, 1]$ with $t^1 < t^2$ and take $k \in I_{n+1}$. If $z_k(\pi(t^1)) < 0$ then $z_k(\pi(t^1)) < z_k(\pi(t^2)) \leq 0$, if $z_k(\pi(t^1)) = 0$ then $z_k(\pi(t^2)) = 0$, and if $z_k(\pi(t^1)) > 0$ then $z_k(\pi(t^1)) > z_k(\pi(t^2)) \geq 0$.*

Proof If $\lambda^* = 1$ then the proof of Theorem 4.8 is trivial, so consider the case $\lambda^* < 1$. Let $s^1, s^2 \in \mathcal{S}$ be such that $\pi(t^1) \in C(s^1)$ and $\pi(t^2) \in C(s^2)$. Let $j_- \in I^-(s^2)$ then by Theorem 4.7 $j_- \in I^-(s^1)$ and so $\frac{\pi_{j_-}(t^2)}{\pi_{j_-}(t^1)} = \frac{(\lambda^*-1)t^2+1}{(\lambda^*-1)t^1+1} < 1$. Let $j_+, j'_+ \in I^+(s^2)$ then using Theorem 4.7 $\frac{\pi_{j_+}(t^2)}{\pi_{j_+}(t^1)} = \frac{\pi_{j'_+}(t^2)}{\pi_{j'_+}(t^1)}$. If $j_0 \in I^0(s^2) \cap I^-(s^1)$ then $\frac{\pi_{j_0}(t^2)}{\pi_{j_0}(t^1)} \geq \frac{\pi_{j_-}(t^2)}{\pi_{j_-}(t^1)}$. Moreover $j_0 \notin J_{\max}(\pi(t^1), \pi(t^2))$ since otherwise by Lemma 4.1 $z_{j_0}(\pi(t^1)) > z_{j_0}(\pi(t^2)) = 0$, and a contradiction would be obtained. Similarly, $j_0 \in I^0(s^2) \cap I^0(s^1)$ implies $j_0 \notin J_{\min}(\pi(t^1), \pi(t^2)) \cup J_{\max}(\pi(t^1), \pi(t^2))$, and $j_0 \in I^0(s^2) \cap I^+(s^1)$ implies $\frac{\pi_{j_0}(t^2)}{\pi_{j_0}(t^1)} \leq \frac{\pi_{j_+}(t^2)}{\pi_{j_+}(t^1)}$ and $j_0 \notin J_{\min}(\pi(t^1), \pi(t^2))$. Consequently, $I^-(s^2) \subset J_{\min}(\pi(t^1), \pi(t^2))$ and $I^+(s^2) \subset J_{\max}(\pi(t^1), \pi(t^2))$. Using this result and Lemma 4.1, $z_k(\pi(t^2)) < 0$ implies $z_k(\pi(t^1)) < z_k(\pi(t^2))$ and $z_k(\pi(t^2)) > 0$ implies $z_k(\pi(t^1)) > z_k(\pi(t^2))$. By Theorem 4.7 $z_k(\pi(t^2)) \leq 0$ if $z_k(\pi(t^1)) < 0$, $z_k(\pi(t^2)) = 0$ if $z_k(\pi(t^1)) = 0$, and $z_k(\pi(t^2)) \geq 0$ if $z_k(\pi(t^1)) > 0$. Q.E.D.

Theorem 4.9 *Let be given a total excess demand function z satisfying Assumptions A3-A7 and let $v \in S^n$ be a starting price system. Let $\bar{t} \in [0, 1]$ be given. Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\forall j \in I_{n+1}$:*

$\forall t \in (\bar{t} - \varepsilon, \bar{t}) \cap [0, 1]$, $\pi_j(t) < \pi_j(\bar{t})$ if $z_j(\pi(\bar{t})) > 0$ and $\pi_j(t) > \pi_j(\bar{t})$ if $z_j(\pi(\bar{t})) < 0$,

$\forall t \in (\bar{t}, \bar{t} + \varepsilon) \cap [0, 1]$, $\pi_j(t) > \pi_j(\bar{t})$ if $z_j(\pi(\bar{t})) > 0$ and $\pi_j(t) < \pi_j(\bar{t})$ if $z_j(\pi(\bar{t})) < 0$.

Proof For $\lambda^* = 1$ the proof of Theorem 4.9 is trivial, so consider the case $\lambda^* < 1$. By continuity of the functions z and π it is possible to choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\forall j \in I_{n+1}$, $\forall t \in (\bar{t} - \varepsilon, \bar{t} + \varepsilon) \cap [0, 1]$, $z_j(\pi(t)) > 0$ if $z_j(\pi(\bar{t})) > 0$ and $z_j(\pi(t)) < 0$ if $z_j(\pi(\bar{t})) < 0$.

Let $t \in (\bar{t} - \varepsilon, \bar{t} + \varepsilon) \cap [0, 1]$ and $z_k(\pi(\bar{t})) < 0$. Then $\pi_k(t) = ((\lambda^* - 1)t + 1)v_k$. Hence if $t \neq \bar{t}$ then $(t - \bar{t})(\pi_k(t) - \pi_k(\bar{t})) = (\lambda^* - 1)(t - \bar{t})^2 v_k < 0$.

Consider the case where $k \in I_{n+1}$ is such that $z_k(\pi(\bar{t})) > 0$ and $t \in (\bar{t}, \bar{t} + \varepsilon) \cap [0, 1]$. Suppose $\pi_k(t) < \pi_k(\bar{t})$, so $\frac{\pi_k(\bar{t})}{\pi_k(t)} > 1$. Then $\frac{\pi_j(\bar{t})}{\pi_j(t)} > 1$, $\forall j \in I_{n+1}$ satisfying $z_j(\pi(\bar{t})) > 0$. Also $\frac{\pi_j(\bar{t})}{\pi_j(t)} > 1$, $\forall j \in I_{n+1}$ satisfying $z_j(\pi(\bar{t})) < 0$. Hence for some $j' \in I_{n+1}$, $z_{j'}(\pi(t)) = 0$, and $j' \in J_{\min}(\pi(t), \pi(\bar{t}))$. By Lemma 4.1 it holds that $z_{j'}(\pi(\bar{t})) > 0$, a contradiction with the choice of ε . The case where $z_k(\pi(\bar{t})) > 0$ and $t \in (\bar{t} - \varepsilon, \bar{t}) \cap [0, 1]$ can be treated similarly. Q.E.D.

References

- Arrow, K.J., H.D. Block, and L. Hurwicz (1959), "On the Stability of the Competitive Equilibrium, II", *Econometrica*, 27, 82-109.
- Debreu, G. (1974), "Excess Demand Functions", *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 1, 15-21.
- Dierker, E. (1972), "Two Remarks on the Number of Equilibria of an Economy", *Econometrica*, 40, 951-955.
- Dierker, E. (1974), *Topological Methods in Walrasian Economics*, Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems, 92, Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Doup, T.M., G. van der Laan, and A.J.J. Talman (1987), "The $(2^{n+1} - 2)$ -Ray Algorithm: A New Simplicial Algorithm to Compute Economic Equilibria", *Mathematical Programming*, 39, 241-252.
- Elzen, A.H. van den (1993), *Adjustment Processes for Exchange Economies and Noncooperative Games*, Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems, 402, Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Garcia, C.B., and W.I. Zangwill (1981), *Pathways to Solutions, Fixed Points, and Equilibria*, Prentice-Hall Series in Computational Mathematics, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs.
- Hildenbrand, W., and A.P. Kirman (1988), *Equilibrium Analysis, Variations on Themes by Edgeworth and Walras*, North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- Jongen, H.Th., P. Jonker, and F. Twilt (1983), *Nonlinear Optimization in \mathbb{R}^n , I. Morse Theory, Chebyshev Approximation*, Methoden und Verfahren der Mathematischen Physik, Band 29, Verlag Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.
- Kamiya, K. (1990), "A Globally Stable Price Adjustment Process", *Econometrica*, 58, 1481-1485.
- Keenan, D.C. (1981), "Further Remarks on the Global Newton Method", *Journal of Mathemat-*

ical Economics, 8, 159-165.

Kellog, R.B., T.Y. Li, and J. Yorke (1976), "A Constructive Proof of the Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem and Computational Results", *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 4, 473-483.

Laan, G. van der, and A.J.J. Talman (1987), "A Convergent Price Adjustment Process", *Economics Letters*, 23, 119-123.

Mantel, R.R., (1974), "On the Characterization of Aggregate Excess Demand", *Journal of Economic Theory*, 7, 348-353.

Mas-Colell, A. (1985), *The Theory of General Economic Equilibrium, A Differentiable Approach*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Munkres, J.R. (1975), *Topology, A First Course*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs.

Saari, D.G. (1985), "Iterative Price Mechanisms", *Econometrica*, 53, 1117-1131.

Saari, D.G., and C.P. Simon (1978), "Effective Price Mechanisms", *Econometrica*, 46, 1097-1125.

Samuelson, P.A. (1941), "The Stability of Equilibrium", *Econometrica*, 9, 97-120.

Scarf, H. (1960), "Some Examples of Global Instability of the Competitive Equilibrium", *International Economic Review*, 1, 157-172.

Smale, S. (1976), "Convergent Process of Price Adjustment and Global Newton Methods", *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 3, 107-120.

Smale, S. (1981), "Global Analysis and Economics", in K.J. Arrow and M.D. Intriligator (eds.), *Handbook of Mathematical Economics, Volume I*, North Holland, Amsterdam, pp. 331-371.

Sonnenschein, H. (1973), "Do Walras' Identity and Continuity Characterize the Class of Community Demand Functions", *Journal of Economic Theory*, 6, 345-354.

Varian, H. (1977), "A Remark on Boundary Restrictions in the Global Newton Method", *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 4, 127-130.

Walras, L. (1874), *Éléments d'Economie Politique Pure*, L. Corbaz and Company, Lausanne.

Discussion Paper Series, CentER, Tilburg University, The Netherlands:

(For previous papers please consult previous discussion papers.)

No.	Author(s)	Title
9344	H. Carlsson and S. Dasgupta	Noise-Proof Equilibria in Signaling Games
9345	F. van der Ploeg and A.L. Bovenberg	Environmental Policy, Public Goods and the Marginal Cost of Public Funds
9346	J.P.C. Blanc and R.D. van der Mei	The Power-series Algorithm Applied to Polling Systems with a Dormant Server
9347	J.P.C. Blanc	Performance Analysis and Optimization with the Power- series Algorithm
9348	R.M.W.J. Beetsma and F. van der Ploeg	Intramarginal Interventions, Bands and the Pattern of EMS Exchange Rate Distributions
9349	A. Simonovits	Intercohort Heterogeneity and Optimal Social Insurance Systems
9350	R.C. Douven and J.C. Engwerda	Is There Room for Convergence in the E.C.?
9351	F. Vella and M. Verbeek	Estimating and Interpreting Models with Endogenous Treatment Effects: The Relationship Between Competing Estimators of the Union Impact on Wages
9352	C. Meghir and G. Weber	Intertemporal Non-separability or Borrowing Restrictions? A Disaggregate Analysis Using the US CEX Panel
9353	V. Feltkamp	Alternative Axiomatic Characterizations of the Shapley and Banzhaf Values
9354	R.J. de Groof and M.A. van Tuijl	Aspects of Goods Market Integration. A Two-Country-Two -Sector Analysis
9355	Z. Yang	A Simplicial Algorithm for Computing Robust Stationary Points of a Continuous Function on the Unit Simplex
9356	E. van Damme and S. Hurkens	Commitment Robust Equilibria and Endogenous Timing
9357	W. Güth and B. Peleg	On Ring Formation In Auctions
9358	V. Bhaskar	Neutral Stability In Asymmetric Evolutionary Games
9359	F. Vella and M. Verbeek	Estimating and Testing Simultaneous Equation Panel Data Models with Censored Endogenous Variables
9360	W.B. van den Hout and J.P.C. Blanc	The Power-Series Algorithm Extended to the <i>BMAP/PH/1</i> Queue

No.	Author(s)	Title
9361	R. Heuts and J. de Klein	An (s,q) Inventory Model with Stochastic and Interrelated Lead Times
9362	K.-E. Wärneryd	A Closer Look at Economic Psychology
9363	P.J.-J. Herings	On the Connectedness of the Set of Constrained Equilibria
9364	P.J.-J. Herings	A Note on "Macroeconomic Policy in a Two-Party System as a Repeated Game"
9365	F. van der Ploeg and A. L. Bovenberg	Direct Crowding Out, Optimal Taxation and Pollution Abatement
9366	M. Pradhan	Sector Participation in Labour Supply Models: Preferences or Rationing?
9367	H.G. Bloemen and A. Kapteyn	The Estimation of Utility Consistent Labor Supply Models by Means of Simulated Scores
9368	M.R. Baye, D. Kovenock and C.G. de Vries	The Solution to the Tullock Rent-Seeking Game When $R > 2$: Mixed-Strategy Equilibria and Mean Dissipation Rates
9369	T. van de Klundert and S. Smulders	The Welfare Consequences of Different Regimes of Oligopolistic Competition in a Growing Economy with Firm-Specific Knowledge
9370	G. van der Laan and D. Talman	Intersection Theorems on the Simplotope
9371	S. Muto	Alternating-Move Preplays and $vN - M$ Stable Sets in Two Person Strategic Form Games
9372	S. Muto	Voters' Power in Indirect Voting Systems with Political Parties: the Square Root Effect
9373	S. Smulders and R. Gradus	Pollution Abatement and Long-term Growth
9374	C. Fernandez, J. Osiewalski and M.F.J. Steel	Marginal Equivalence in v -Spherical Models
9375	E. van Damme	Evolutionary Game Theory
9376	P.M. Kort	Pollution Control and the Dynamics of the Firm: the Effects of Market Based Instruments on Optimal Firm Investments
9377	A. L. Bovenberg and F. van der Ploeg	Optimal Taxation, Public Goods and Environmental Policy with Involuntary Unemployment
9378	F. Thuijsman, B. Peleg, M. Amitai & A. Shmida	Automata, Matching and Foraging Behavior of Bees
9379	A. Lejour and H. Verbon	Capital Mobility and Social Insurance in an Integrated Market

No.	Author(s)	Title
9380	C. Fernandez, J. Osiewalski and M. Steel	The Continuous Multivariate Location-Scale Model Revisited: A Tale of Robustness
9381	F. de Jong	Specification, Solution and Estimation of a Discrete Time Target Zone Model of EMS Exchange Rates
9401	J.P.C. Kleijnen and R.Y. Rubinstein	Monte Carlo Sampling and Variance Reduction Techniques
9402	F.C. Drost and B.J.M. Werker	Closing the Garch Gap: Continuous Time Garch Modeling
9403	A. Kapteyn	The Measurement of Household Cost Functions: Revealed Preference Versus Subjective Measures
9404	H.G. Bloemen	Job Search, Search Intensity and Labour Market Transitions: An Empirical Exercise
9405	P.W.J. De Bijl	Moral Hazard and Noisy Information Disclosure
9406	A. De Waegenaere	Redistribution of Risk Through Incomplete Markets with Trading Constraints
9407	A. van den Nouweland, P. Borm, W. van Golstein Brouwers, R. Groot Bruinderink, and S. Tijs	A Game Theoretic Approach to Problems in Telecommunication
9408	A.L. Bovenberg and F. van der Ploeg	Consequences of Environmental Tax Reform for Involuntary Unemployment and Welfare
9409	P. Smit	Arnoldi Type Methods for Eigenvalue Calculation: Theory and Experiments
9410	J. Eichberger and D. Kelsey	Non-additive Beliefs and Game Theory
9411	N. Dagan, R. Serrano and O. Volij	A Non-cooperative View of Consistent Bankruptcy Rules
9412	H. Bester and E. Petrakis	Coupons and Oligopolistic Price Discrimination
9413	G. Koop, J. Osiewalski and M.F.J. Steel	Bayesian Efficiency Analysis with a Flexible Form: The AIM Cost Function
9414	C. Kilby	World Bank-Borrower Relations and Project Supervision
9415	H. Bester	A Bargaining Model of Financial Intermediation
9416	J.J.G. Lemmen and S.C.W. Eijffinger	The Price Approach to Financial Integration: Decomposing European Money Market Interest Rate Differentials

No.	Author(s)	Title
9417	J. de la Horra and C. Fernandez	Sensitivity to Prior Independence via Farlie-Gumbel -Morgenstern Model
9418	D. Talman and Z. Yang	A Simplicial Algorithm for Computing Proper Nash Equilibria of Finite Games
9419	H.J. Bierens	Nonparametric Cointegration Tests
9420	G. van der Laan, D. Talman and Z. Yang	Intersection Theorems on Polytopes
9421	R. van den Brink and R.P. Gilles	Ranking the Nodes in Directed and Weighted Directed Graphs
9422	A. van Soest	Youth Minimum Wage Rates: The Dutch Experience
9423	N. Dagan and O. Volij	Bilateral Comparisons and Consistent Fair Division Rules in the Context of Bankruptcy Problems
9424	R. van den Brink and P. Borm	Digraph Competitions and Cooperative Games
9425	P.H.M. Ruys and R.P. Gilles	The Interdependence between Production and Allocation
9426	T. Callan and A. van Soest	Family Labour Supply and Taxes in Ireland
9427	R.M.W.J. Beetsma and F. van der Ploeg	Macroeconomic Stabilisation and Intervention Policy under an Exchange Rate Band
9428	J.P.C. Kleijnen and W. van Groenendaal	Two-stage versus Sequential Sample-size Determination in Regression Analysis of Simulation Experiments
9429	M. Pradhan and A. van Soest	Household Labour Supply in Urban Areas of a Developing Country
9430	P.J.J. Herings	Endogenously Determined Price Rigidities
9431	H.A. Keuzenkamp and J.R. Magnus	On Tests and Significance in Econometrics
9432	C. Dang, D. Talman and Z. Wang	A Homotopy Approach to the Computation of Economic Equilibria on the Unit Simplex
9433	R. van den Brink	An Axiomatization of the Disjunctive Permission Value for Games with a Permission Structure
9434	C. Veld	Warrant Pricing: A Review of Empirical Research
9435	V. Feltkamp, S. Tijs and S. Muto	Bird's Tree Allocations Revisited

No.	Author(s)	Title
9436	G.-J. Otten, P. Borm, B. Peleg and S. Tijs	The MC-value for Monotonic NTU-Games
9437	S. Hurkens	Learning by Forgetful Players: From Primitive Formations to Persistent Retracts
9438	J.-J. Herings, D. Talman, and Z. Yang	The Computation of a Continuum of Constrained Equilibria
9439	E. Schaling and D. Smyth	The Effects of Inflation on Growth and Fluctuations in Dynamic Macroeconomic Models
9440	J. Arin and V. Feltkamp	The Nucleolus and Kernel of Veto-rich Transferable Utility Games
9441	P.-J. Jost	On the Role of Commitment in a Class of Signalling Problems
9442	J. Bendor, D. Mookherjee, and D. Ray	Aspirations, Adaptive Learning and Cooperation in Repeated Games
9443	G. van der Laan, D. Talman and Zaifu Yang	Modelling Cooperative Games in Permutational Structure
9444	G.J. Almekinders and S.C.W. Eijffinger	Accounting for Daily Bundesbank and Federal Reserve Intervention: A Friction Model with a GARCH Application
9445	A. De Waegenaere	Equilibria in Incomplete Financial Markets with Portfolio Constraints and Transaction Costs
9446	E. Schaling and D. Smyth	The Effects of Inflation on Growth and Fluctuations in Dynamic Macroeconomic Models
9447	G. Koop, J. Osiewalski and M.F.J. Steel	Hospital Efficiency Analysis Through Individual Effects: A Bayesian Approach
9448	H. Hamers, J. Suijs, S. Tijs and P. Borm	The Split Core for Sequencing Games
9449	G.-J. Otten, H. Peters, and O. Volij	Two Characterizations of the Uniform Rule for Division Problems with Single-Peaked Preferences
9450	A.L. Bovenberg and S.A. Smulders	Transitional Impacts of Environmental Policy in an Endogenous Growth Model
9451	F. Verboven	International Price Discrimination in the European Car Market: An Econometric Model of Oligopoly Behavior with Product Differentiation
9452	P.J.-J. Herings	A Globally and Universally Stable Price Adjustment Process

P.O. BOX 90153, 5000 LE TILBURG, THE NETHERLANDS

Bibliotheek K. U. Brabant



17 000 01158979 4